This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 08167005 5

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

VOLUME XL.

FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME V.

JANUARY, MARCH, MAY, 1846.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM CROSBY.
NEW YORK: C. S. FRANCIS & CO.
LONDON: CHAPMAN, BROTHERS, 121 NEWGATE ST.
1846.

Boston Public Library, No. 66172/06

PRINTED BY ANDREWS AND PRENTISS,
DEVONSHIRE STREET.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JANUARY, 1846.

Art. I.—SAINT AUGUSTINE AND HIS TIMES.*

Bustling and utilitarian as our age is generally called, it cannot reasonably be accused of slighting the lessons of the past or despising the names of the good and great of former times. Indeed, the very ardor with which we are urged to join in the bold enterprises and sanguine movements of the day has led many to take an opposite turn, and seek in the study of antiquity a quiet and a wisdom which they find not in the restless tumult around them. They meet with more to soothe and edify them in the Greek and Roman classics or the Christian Fathers, the wisdom of Indian sages or Egyptian priests, than in the

* 1. *Histoire de Saint Augustin, Sa Vie, Ses Œuvres, Son Siecle, Influence de Son Genie.* Par M. Poujoulat. Paris. 1845. (History of Saint Augustine, his Life, his Works, his Age, the Influence of his Genius. By M. Poujoulat.) Three Vols. 8vo.

2. *A Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West.* Translated by Members of the English Church. Oxford. 1840—45. Vols. I—XX. 8vo.

3. *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times.* By the Author of "Spiritual Despotism." Fourth Edition, with Supplement, Index and Tables. London. 1844. Two Vols. 8vo.

pages of political newspapers or reform magazines, the visions of financial schemers or the disputes of sectarian divines.

While we are receiving from the principal nations of Europe every school of new philosophy and every project of social innovation, we are assured from the same quarters by other voices, that all philosophy is a sin against faith and all innovation is a rebellion against authority. France gives us Fourier with his promised millennium of industrial association, and De Maistre with his eulogies of the dark ages and his predictions of the return of Papal dominion. From Germany the reverent voices of Adam Moehler and Frederick Schlegel have entreated us not to listen to the war-notes of Frederick Strauss and Henry Heine, nor prefer to the ancient Church with its literature of faith, modern rationalism with its literature of the senses and understanding. England, too, our own England, sends forth antagonist influences quite as various. Robert Owen comes to teach us his plans of socialism, and Dr. Wiseman writes to win us back to the Roman Church. Carlyle calls the Pope a miserable chimera, and Kenelm Digby lauds the Papal ages, as the "ages of faith." With one hand our mother country gives us railroads, and bids us by her example traverse the ends of the earth; with the other she holds out to us the Oxford Tracts, and insists upon quietude, fasting and prayer as the path of peace and the way of life. As a people we are ready to welcome every form of foreign influence, and, whether moved by imitation or our own dispositions, are beginning to exhibit on a large scale the antagonist tendencies of which we have spoken. We are carrying out democratic theories, and giving full scope to priestly domination; we are establishing Fourierite communities, and building stately cathedrals; we are engaging in earnest enterprises of business and reform, that agitate the soul, and encouraging music, painting, sculpture, gardening, and the arts, that soothe the soul. We are erecting fine houses as if we were to live forever, and laying out beautiful cemeteries as if it were no great ill to die. From some traits of our character it would seem as if David Crockett with his noted adage embodied our national genius, while in other traits we show some kindred with Old Mortality and his love of wandering among the graves.

Forward as our march is, we tend now strongly to the study of the past. We love to stop in our course, to visit the tombs of our fathers and build monuments to the saints of our own and former ages. Not to speak of the number of historical works printed and read among us, it is surprising that so many treatises upon sacred antiquity have been sent from our presses, and that the Christian Fathers are winning so much attention at our hands. Whatever may be the cause of this, — whether intellectual curiosity or sectarian strife, we cannot say, — it is evident that great questions now before our people must lead us to study anew the history of the Church, and come to a satisfactory conclusion concerning the men and the doctrines of the primitive ages.

Taking Christendom at large, it is obvious that within the last ten or fifteen years the study of the Christian Fathers has been revived in a remarkable manner. Without quite accepting the pseudo-prophet Miller's doctrine of a speedy end of the world, to be accompanied by a bodily resurrection of the saints, we may say that in one sense in our time the saints have already been raised; "the souls of them that suffered for the witness of Jesus and the word of God" have been seen and appreciated anew. Their spirit has been studied, while their works have been faithfully exhibited. No longer in their original voluminous manuscripts, nor in their former cumbrous folios, their thoughts now appear with all the aids of modern art, the more attractive garb of modern print and editing. Chrysostom and Augustine, subdued as was their pride, could not but have rejoiced, had they foreseen the honors paid them in this nineteenth century; and in view of the elegant octavos in which Paris and Oxford have enshrined their works, they would have bestowed no small benediction upon the memory of Dr. Faustus, and have broken the spell that has coupled his name with the prince of darkness.

Of course we are far from thinking that the mass of readers among us will soon care much for patristic lore. Its results, however, are interesting all persons of Christian faith and common intellectual curiosity, whilst an earnest band of thinkers and scholars, both in the Old World and the New, are turning to the pages of the Fathers for oracles of wisdom that can, as it seems to them, cure the chief of

prevalent follies. One reason of the revival of the study is, doubtless, to be found in that love for all historical investigation which so strongly marks recent literature. Somewhat suspicious of mere theories of society and philosophies of religion, we wish to know what has actually been done in former times to carry men forward, and are more disposed to value ideas and institutions that have worked well than ambitious schemes that only promise well. The historic schools of Germany, England, and even France show a strong conservative tendency, and prove that our nineteenth century with all its bustling progress is far more reverently retrospective than the eighteenth, far more disposed to unite memory with hope as guides of the world. As a result of this historical movement, of course the Christian Fathers must come in for their share of attention; and merely philosophical fidelity, to say nothing of Christian faith, has moved writers of the stamp of Guizot and Michelet to try to appreciate fairly the men, whose works best illustrate that great period in which the world passed from Paganism to Christianity, and the foundations of our Christendom were laid upon the ruins of ancient empires.

Moreover, the religious aspect of our age favors the study of the Fathers. There is in some quarters a strong suspicion, that Protestantism has gone too far in encouraging freedom of thought and disparaging the authority of creeds, traditions and priesthoods. Considerable numbers of thinking persons, who are reluctant to cast themselves at the feet of the Pope and surrender their freedom to the council of Trent, are seeking or advocating some middle ground between Papal despotism and what they call Protestant self-will. The Christian Fathers are held up as standing on such middle ground, and we are asked to read them if we would be saved from both the perilous extremes in the theology of our day, and learn to harmonise just liberty of thought with due recognition of the Church and its traditions. There is not a little of this tendency among the Protestants of Germany, although it has been exhibited to us more directly in the Oxford Tractarians and the various works which they have written and edited. At the time when liberal principles in religion and government were at their height in England, these men conceived the plan and undertook the work of leading their country back to

ancient authority both in Church and State. In the midst of the enthusiasm of the Reform Bill and the emancipation of Dissenters and Romanists, these scholars looked with sadness upon the innovation, sought some remedy in the lessons of the past, and not stopping with the principles of the Reformation, in Germany or England, nor willing to countenance the usurpations of Rome, they appealed boldly to the Christian Fathers, and thus brought on a reaction against modern liberalism, that has produced already great effect in their own country, and has gained not a few followers among us, some among mature and cautious minds, many among the young and romantic. It is evident, that the chief part of the recent theological literature of England is strongly tinged with the Oxford doctrines. The result has been very bitter to the Evangelical party in the English Church, as we may surely infer, when so wise and good a man as Isaac Taylor, the author of the work on Ancient Christianity, the title of which is given at the head of this article, interrupts his previous course of authorship, gives himself so entirely to this one topic, and seems sometimes in danger of losing his temper at the asperity with which he, and all kindred champions of what he calls Evangelical Christianity, are treated by those who give tradition so important a place by the side of the Bible. His work, in connection with the Oxford Library of the Fathers, the title of which we have also given, will enable our readers, who are not ambitious of a more laborious study of the Greek and Latin originals, to form a good idea of the questions at issue between the two parties in the English Church. As Mr. Taylor is an earnest member of the Establishment, we are not, by referring to him with favor, quoting any writer hostile to that Church.

His book is probably the ablest treatise on Ancient Christianity, or rather the Christianity of the Nicene age, that has appeared in our time. Indeed so far as it deals with the Nicene Fathers in the claims set up for them as Catholic authority, the work is unsurpassed by any that can be named. It is superior to the famous work of Daillê, by concentrating its light upon the most important point of the subject and breaking the authority of the Fathers by assaulting the centre of their position. It differs from the more celebrated treatise of Chillingworth, on the religion of

Protestants, which was suggested by the work of Daillé, in dealing more with facts than abstractions, by exhibiting tradition as it was in the age of its boasted purity, and showing conclusively what was the actual doctrine of the Nicene Fathers, and what folly and absurdity must follow from leaving the sure rule of Scripture and accepting their authority. Mr. Taylor deals almost solely with the doctrine of celibacy as held by the Fathers and with the development of its consequences. He regards this doctrine as the parent of all superstition and fanaticism, morbid feeling, false doctrine and pernicious formalism. He finds such fruits of its influence in the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era, as lead him to regard the mighty hierarchy which was subsequently built up by Gregory I., and completed by Gregory VII., as a great reform, a salutary check upon the error and wickedness already brought into being. He makes ample quotations from the Nicene Fathers to prove his position, that they generally held the doctrine of celibacy as the highest virtue, and that their works show that the state of religion around them was very low. To us his work is conclusive upon one point, that if the Christian Fathers are to be taken as authoritative guides, we must at once quit our common Protestant principles, believe in the sanctity of celibacy, the worth of relics, the magical power of the sacraments, and all of Popery except the doctrine of a supremacy of the Pope otherwise than as the primacy of honor. Mr. Taylor's book is interesting from its unity of purpose. He allows the champions of tradition to take their strongest ground among their strongest authorities, and then bears down upon the centre of their position with the force of a Nelson's attack or a Napoleon's charge. Undoubtedly by dwelling so much upon one point and with a purpose so hostile to the opposite party, he is in great danger of overlooking the true worth of the Fathers.

It is therefore well for those who read his somewhat disheartening pages, to take a glance at the brighter side of the subject, and learn from the series of Translations before us, the Library of the Fathers, how much wisdom and piety they contain. Whatever may be thought of the Nicene theology, we must find much to respect in all these volumes. Of the authors here given, Augustine, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Athanasius,

Tertullian, Gregory, Pacian, four or five stand out prominently as writers. No reader can deny that Tertullian is full of fire, or that Athanasius is mighty in argument, or that Chrysostom is eloquent, or Augustine profound. We could have wished that Clement and Origen had been included in these volumes, and have hope that their noble spirit and deep wisdom will give them a place ere long in the series. Yet we must remember that the chief favorites of the translators have not yet been represented; that of the choice three, Ambrose, Basil and Chrysostom, only the last has appeared in these volumes. Perhaps it is not wholly wrong, to desire that with specimens of the best works of the Nicene Fathers some of the worst had been also given, that we might judge of the age in its folly as well as its wisdom, and see what idle legends and degrading superstitions the wisest of them cherished, what monkish fanaticism Athanasius could eulogise and what priestly miracles Augustine could credit.

We propose to speak especially of one among the Christian Fathers in connection with his times, the one who has exercised a more permanent influence than any of them. Aurelius Augustinus, commonly called St. Augustine, is of course the man. We will try to give some idea of the age, the man, and his works.

He was born in the middle of the fourth century, a century more momentous to Christendom than any other except that in which Jesus lived, and that in which Luther wrote. During this century Christianity had become the established religion of the Roman Empire. Constantine had laid his sceptre upon the Christian altar; Julian had striven in vain to supplant the faith of the cross by his splendid eclecticism of philosophical deism, natural symbolism and vulgar Paganism; and by the labors of a brilliant company of orators, prelates, scholars and theologians, the Christian doctrines were settled for ages, and ecclesiastical institutions were consolidated. We shall be better able to estimate the leading men of this period by a glance at the previous history of the Church. The first writers after the death of the Apostles are the Apostolical Fathers, whose writings are chiefly pastoral and practical, such as the Epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius. Next come the defenders of Christianity against Heathen assaults, the Apologists,

such as Justin Martyr and Tatian. Their works are valuable chiefly as showing the common objections to Christianity and the prevalent mode of meeting them. Gradually as the religion gained progress, and won for itself strongholds in various countries and allied itself with intellectual culture, it began to show itself under various forms with the most marked characteristics. Before Constantine took the Gospel under his patronage, the Church had shown itself to be the most stable power in the Empire, and had combined great unity of action with considerable freedom of thought. The different communities of Christians had their favorite tendencies. Look at the various seats of Christianity around the shores of the Mediterranean at the beginning of the third century, and we see at once a broad diversity of character and tendency. In the East and among those who spoke the Greek language we find, that at Alexandria, the city where Greece and Judea had blended their civilization, Christians were disposed to connect philosophy with religion; at Antioch in Syria, so long the centre of Apostolic missions, they were more disposed to the critical study of the Bible; at Ephesus and in the whole of Asia Minor, where St. John had labored so long, they were more disposed to urge the practical principles of Christianity. Come westward, where Rome ruled and the Latin language was spoken, we find the idea of an authoritative priesthood more strongly enforced and see the germs of the hierarchy that Hildebrand finally consolidated. One portion of the Western Church, the Christians of North Africa, first of whom was Tertullian and chief of whom was Augustine, were occupied most with those doctrines and duties that bear upon conversion and exhibit a moral strictness which has commended them especially to historians of the Evangelical school. But alike in Rome and Carthage the Church of the West was the champion of spiritual power, whether in church organization acting on numbers, or by direct appeal subduing the individual soul. The spirit of Peter and Paul seemed to rule the West, that of James and John the East.

We thus see that Augustine was surrounded by peculiar influences. He came upon his illustrious mission in a peculiar country at a peculiar time. A citizen of North Africa, he was surrounded by zealots whose fervor had

been kindled by the revivalist principles of Tertullian, and blended either with the strong hierarchical dogmas of his disciple Cyprian, or else with the fierce fanaticism of the schismatic Donatists. He lived in the palmy age of the Imperial Church, and in near relations with the most conspicuous personages of his day. He was the convert of Ambrose, the correspondent of Jerome, the contemporary of Chrysostom, the opponent of Pelagius. He was brought into contact with the chief literary, political and ecclesiastical movements of his time, and his life more than that of any other man illustrates the influences that were brought to bear upon a thinking mind in the fourth and fifth centuries. We have reason to rejoice that so much has been permitted to reach us concerning his history, especially concerning his trials of faith.

Augustine was born in the year 354 at Tagaste, an obscure Numidian village near Carthage, in North Africa. The place of his birth might lead us to expect some characteristics akin to those he exhibited. He probably bore in his veins the warm blood of a Nomad race of Africa, tempered by the influence of the Phenician colonists and Roman conquerors. How far each element predominated in his ancestry, we have no means of ascertaining. Certain it is that he had much of the African fire, the Oriental sentiment, the Roman fortitude and prudence. His education was not happy, although probably its trials and temptations contributed much to the depth of his experience and the subsequent power of his efforts. His father was a Pagan until near the close of life, and a man of little elevation of character. His mother was a Christian of eminent piety. She evidently had much trouble in saving her son from the corrupting opinions and manners around him, and in striving to educate him in Christian principles. He describes the troubles and vices of his boyhood with great minuteness. His graphic pictures of his mischievous pranks, as, for example, his robbing the pear-tree when he knew the pears were not fit to eat, shows how much all bad boys are alike, and that notwithstanding the progress of civilization there are not a few truants in our grave New England to remind us of the young rogue of Numidia. He does not give a very flattering account of his boyish scholarship, and appears to have had little love for his severer studies, such

as Greek and Mathematics, whilst he had a great fondness for the Latin and especially its poetic literature. He speaks with as much emphasis of his trials in learning the multiplication table as could any of our modern dunces or idlers. Yet such was his evident vivacity, and especially his fondness for poetry and declamation, that his parents thought best to give him the advantage of a city school in the neighborhood, at Madaura, where he learned grammar and rhetoric. He made no great progress there either in character or learning, and returned home at the age of sixteen, and sank into habits of idleness and dissipation. His mother, good Christian as she was, constantly expostulated with him, but in vain. He treated her not ungently, but paid no regard to what seemed to him her womanish talk. At the age of seventeen, he was sent from home again, and about this time he lost his father. At the school in Carthage he soon took the lead alike in the studies and the dissipations of the scholars. While here, his son Adeodatus was born, of an illicit connection. Yet his conscience was not wholly dormant, and he had occasional pangs of remorse. He was not under good influences, although he seems to have yearned for them. The views of Christianity that were presented to him do not appear to have won his assent, much less his affections. In his nineteenth year he was much impressed by reading a work of Cicero, which contained an exhortation to philosophy, and bore the name of Hortensius. This kindled within him a burning thirst for wisdom, and gave him a disgust for the riotous companions with whom he had been so intimate, a set of dashing bullies, who were called "subverters," and who seem to have had something of the character of the "renowners" of the German Universities. He resolved to abandon vice, not so much in the spirit of the Gospel as of the Academy, not so much because vice is sinful as because it is degrading to the dignity of an intellectual being. Such considerations have little power in redeeming men of Augustine's mind and temperament. Philosophy has its place, and is good in its place. But it is not religion, nor has it by itself ever done much to make men turn from their sins. The best of the Greek sages could do little to bring men up to the noble ideal which they set forth. What Socrates, Plato and Zeno could not

do, was not likely to be accomplished by the elegant Roman who repeated in his own way their ideas. Cicero, and such as he, may give some light, may set forth high aims, but can afford no vital warmth, no moving power, no divine sanctions to lead men to follow the light and seek the high aims. Augustine soon found this out, for he was not lacking in shrewdness. His soul craved more substantial food than Cicero's beautiful speculations on the world and man, God and immortality. What Rousseau said of the inadequacy of philosophy, Augustine felt. The Numidian and the Frenchman were much alike in temperament, both having strong passions with deep sentiment, and both recording their lives in the most candid Confessions that have come to us. But the religion which the one dreamed of, the other found, although not without years of weary wandering and bitter disappointment. Without supernatural facts to rest upon in faith, philosophy is very vague and delusive, and they who accept the same nominal principles find practically little firm ground to rest upon in common. The soul of Augustine was like the wind-sown seed, borne about from place to place on its air-tossed pinions. Not until it rested upon the soil of the Christian vineyard did it take root and blossom.

Augustine had always cherished a great reverence for the name of Christ, and had been so much impressed by his mother's instructions that, unbelieving as he was, he declares that "whatsoever was without that name, though never so learned, polished or true, took not entire hold of me." In Cicero's pages he missed this name, and felt desirous of learning more of Christ from the Scriptures, which he had never read, — a fact which gives us no very high idea of the state of Christian knowledge in the see of Carthage. He set himself to reading the Scriptures, but was very much disappointed in them. They seemed far beneath the stateliness of Cicero. From his rhetorical education he had a passion for fine writing, and could not as yet appreciate the sublime simplicity of the sacred books. This he afterwards confessed, and lamented that he did not bring the spirit of humility that can interpret the divine word, and like a little child enter the kingdom of heaven. He was not satisfied with the Christianity of the Bible, but sought something more complex and philosophical. He was just in a state

of mind to become the dupe of the Manicheans, a sect who endeavored to incorporate a system of Oriental philosophy with the doctrines of Jesus and the rites of the Church. Most thoughtful young men of nineteen or twenty are ambitious of finding some philosophical system that shall explain all things and give them a theory of the universe. The vagaries of the theological students in the Old World and the New at present might teach us to be charitable to the young Numidian, and find among present follies fair parallels for his Manichean extravagances. This sect declaimed against all authority, and glorified human reason, while they forced upon it the wildest dogmas. It undoubtedly numbered many profound and earnest minds among its votaries, as all bold theories will. It had enough of philosophy to attract the inquiring, and enough of assertion to awe the simple. It was a strange mingling of Oriental pantheism and Christian forms and phraseology. It showed a sentimentalism ready to weep at the plucking of a radish as if at the extinction of a spark of the divine life, and at the same time a hardness of heart indifferent to human suffering because of the eternal necessity of evil, and scrupling to relieve the hunger of the uninitiated on the ground that to give food to the unspiritual was imprisoning God's gifts in sinful matter and preventing the spirit that pervades nature from disengaging itself from its heavy clogs. The men that held this doctrine pleased Augustine more than Paul and John. While they gratified his speculative curiosity, they probably tended to palliate his vices as only a necessary emanation from the eternal evil. For nine years he is associated with them, much to the mortification of his mother who could with difficulty tolerate his doctrines in her house, and would have closed her doors against him, but for her fervent hope of his conversion. Yet he was an earnest seeker for truth, and while teaching rhetoric, first at Tagaste and then at Carthage, his mind was constantly active. "O truth, truth," cries he, in speaking of himself, the young enthusiast of twenty, "how inwardly did even then the marrow of my soul pant after thee, when they often and diversely and in many and huge books echoed of thee to me, though it were but an echo! And these were the dishes wherein to me, hungering after thee, they, instead of thee, served up the sun and moon,

beautiful works of thine, but yet thy works, not thyself, no, nor thy first works." At twenty-nine his faith in Manicheism is considerably shaken, as he discovers the ignorance and assumption of many of its disciples, and the insufficiency of the doctrine for his needs, and before this he had misgivings of the correctness of the morals of the Manicheans. He is haunted by skeptical doubts, although he cannot yield to them.

He was restless and unhappy. Disgusted with the licentiousness of his scholars at Carthage, and craving greater light and a broader sphere, he sailed for Rome. Falling sick at the house of a Manichean and still fettered by his connection with the sect, he teaches awhile in Rome after his recovery, and relieves his continued discontent by going to Milan, then the most brilliant diocesan city of Italy. Here the main crisis of his life came, and the Numidian rhetorician was transformed into the great theologian and renowned saint. That voyage across the Mediterranean was more important in its results than the passage of his famous countryman, Hannibal, more than five centuries before. The teacher of rhetoric and the great captain of his age both went to yield to a Roman conqueror. Hannibal was overcome by Scipio with fatal loss. Augustine to his vast gain was subdued by a Roman with a will strong as Scipio's, but with weapons mightier than sword and shield.

At Milan Augustine went to church, not with any devout intentions, but led by his rhetorical tastes and by the curiosity so natural in a stranger to hear a preacher of unrivalled fame throughout Italy. He listened to a man who soon awakened far other feelings than the luxurious sense of literary beauty or oratorical eloquence. The preacher was no other than Ambrose, the great prelate of the West, who had been forced to become bishop because he had shown such wisdom and energy as civil governor; who bore the crosier as heroically as he had borne the sword; who had made the sceptre of the haughty Theodosius bow at his feet, and rendered his own anathema mightier than the imperial decree. Augustine was much struck with the manner of Ambrose, alike by his earnest address and his mode of setting forth the Christian doctrines. He became acquainted with him, was kindly received, and although by no means converted, he is evi-

dently within the attraction of that mighty will before which all opposition was wont to yield. He finds some of his difficulties regarding the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament, cleared up by the preaching of Ambrose, who evidently interpreted many things figuratively that offend the reason when taken literally, and who in spite of his stern high-church notions held many of the free, spiritual views of the Greek Father, Origen, concerning the Bible. There was a vein of poetry too in Ambrose that must have won upon the sentiment and imagination of Augustine, for this great prelate was author of celebrated Catholic hymns and an earnest patron of sacred music, which his protegé so enthusiastically loved.

Monica, Augustine's mother, heard with no small joy of her son's present tendencies, and joining him at Milan, confirmed his good resolves, and rejoiced vastly on her own account in the ministrations of Ambrose. She hoped to see her son ere long fully embrace Christianity, now that he had given up his Manichean notions. The change in his mind went on. He now learned to ascribe evil, that awful reality that had so tormented his intellect as well as perverted his heart, to an original perversion of the free-will of man, and not to an eternal and necessary existence. One step more and he might embrace the Catholic faith. He must accept the Church doctrine as to the nature of Christ and his relation to the Father. This step he must take, not by yielding to authority, but in a way congenial with his mind. He fell in with the writings of some of those later Platonists, perhaps Plotinus or Porphyry, who believed in a philosophical Trinity of the Divine nature without believing in Christ, and who thus prepared him, as they have prepared many thoughtful minds, in ancient and modern times, for accepting the Orthodox doctrine upon the subject. A champion of the Church like Horseley glories in this fact, as proving the identity between the teachings of the best philosophy and the Divine word. So far as mere opinions were concerned, Augustine might have entered the Catholic Church, as Ambrose seems to have desired him to do. Still he lingered, and thirty, the age at which a man surely ought to fix upon his plan of life and receive his initiation, found him halting between the world with its pleasures and honors, and religion with its

duties and renunciations. At the age of thirty-two, his chosen hour came. He had long struggled with good success against intellectual doubts, now he was to triumph over the passions that had held him in such thraldom.

The story of his conversion to the Christian life is perhaps too familiar to be dwelt upon. He had been for sometime a diligent student of the Scriptures, especially St. Paul's Epistles, those writings which have ever been so powerful in meeting the wants of persons dissatisfied with themselves, and seeking peace. In a retired garden, he was struggling with his agitated thoughts, when he overheard a voice, which seemed to him miraculous and which probably was from the spirit within his own soul, but which some suppose came from a child in a neighboring house, saying, "Take and read." These words struck him as singularly applicable to his own case, and he opened a manuscript of Paul's Epistles which he had with him, and his eye fell upon this passage from the Romans:—"Not in chambering and wantonness, not in rioting and drunkenness, not in strife and envying; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof." This appeal brought him to the practical point. It was the true crisis of his life, the key to his thoughts and his subsequent labors and influence. In that moment, all his past trials, sins, meditations, struggles, aspirations, concentrated their force, and as he turned away from the evil and gave his heart to God, the divine spark fell upon him. The fire-baptism came, and thenceforth the purification went on, the wood, hay and stubble were consumed, the gold, silver and precious stones of the inner temple remained.

Who will wonder at his subsequent course? Not appealing to the angry strifes of controversial folios, nor resting in the dogmas of doctors of divinity, who will marvel that this young Numidian should now consecrate his vast powers so earnestly to illustrating the free grace of God in converting the soul, and be prone to dwell constantly on the wickedness of mankind and the glory of the divine mercy, and finally incur the danger of merging the freedom of the human will in the all-absorbing power of God? The system of the theologian was an obvious development of the experience of the man. Compare his Confes-

sions with his later theological treatises, and we see in the first the lava of the burning mount, and in the last that lava hardened into stone, or if you prefer the figure, into substantial soil.

In his thirty-third year he received baptism at the hands of Ambrose, together with his son, Adeodatus, a youth of rare promise, although a child of shame. His mother's cup was now full of joy, and she was ready to go in peace to the world so long in her contemplations. His account of her death is the most beautiful passage in his celebrated Confessions. She was to die on her way home to Africa, the year of her son's baptism. His bearing towards her, always tender, was now full of pathos and beauty. He describes an earnest conversation with her a few days before her death; God and heaven were the theme, and mother and son felt that there was between them a spiritual communion that the grave could not sever. He closed her eyes, and committed her body to the earth in a land of strangers. He felt desolate indeed, but not in despair. The good angel of his whole life was not with him in the world any more, but her blessing remained. On the morning after her burial, he awoke with the words of one of the hymns of Ambrose, sounding through his mind like a chant of heavenly choirs. It is the hymn beginning thus: —

Maker of all, the Lord,
And Ruler of the height,
Who robing day in light, hast poured
Soft slumbers o'er the night;
That to our limbs the power
Of toil may be renewed,
And hearts be raised that sink and cower,
And sorrows be subdued.

He closes the part of his Confessions that relates to his years of wandering and trial, with a touching tribute to his mother's memory. He returned to Africa, soon became a priest of the Church, and in seven years from his baptism is raised to the Episcopal chair of Hippo, the royal city of Numidia, where he passed his whole subsequent life, an influential prelate, and a thinker of power unequalled in his time, and perhaps unsurpassed by any of the great theologians of any age, either in the force or the effect of

his works. His life, subsequent to his return, is more to be learned from his works than from any remarkable events. All he wrote bore the coloring of his early experience, therefore have we been so minute in detailing its various stages.

As to the time of composition, Augustine divides his works into four classes. First, those which were written between his conversion and baptism; the chief of which were some philosophical essays, composed in the pleasant retirement of the villa of his friend, Verecundus, and which, as Schleiermacher has justly remarked, seem to be the Tusculan Questions of the philosophic convert, a treatment of familiar academic topics with reference to his new convictions. Next come the works written after his baptism and before his taking orders in the Church; a period of about three years, spent, as probably by St. Paul under similar circumstances, in retirement, meditation and study, saddened however by the death of his son. The principal productions of this period were his books upon the morals of the Manicheans and upon those of the Catholic Church, part of his treatise on free will, and the work upon true religion. Reluctantly on his part, he was made presbyter by the bishop of Hippo, Valerius, and seems to have passed the four next years in labors mainly of a practical character, such as expositions of Scripture, pastoral addresses, and short ethical essays, although he was by no means so absorbed in parish cares as to forget paying his respects occasionally to his old friends, the Manicheans, for whose benefit he completed his work on the will. Towards the end of the year 395, being at the age of forty-one, he was ordained assistant bishop to Valerius, and in a year was left to the sole charge of the diocese by the death of his principal. From that time to his own decease in the year 430, his most celebrated works were written and his greatest influence was exerted. In brilliant succession came forth his Confessions, his "De Trinitate," his treatises against the Pelagians, and his master-piece, the City of God. In this period, besides attending to vast official duties, he recorded the story of his own experience, wrote at great length upon all the principal controversies of the day, opposing now the Donatists, now the Arians, now the Pelagians, vindicated the kingdom of Christ against the

kingdoms of this world, and before sinking into the grave calmly reviewed all his writings and published his corrections in the two books of *Retractationes.*

There was a singular connection between the topic that inspired our author's last great work, the "City of God," and his own fate. He died in the midst of a barbaric invasion which brought a second Alaric to the gates of Hippo, so long the city of his residence. After having revised his most important works as if aware of approaching death, he was destined to breathe his last in a scene of tumult and carnage little in keeping with his many years of quiet life. Hordes of half Christianized barbarians, under Genseric the Vandal, were ravaging the land. Three months after the commencement of the siege of Hippo, Augustine died, inexpressibly grieved at the evil prospects of the church and the people; happy in seeking the better land, in being spared the horrors of beholding his altar desecrated and his flock scattered. Yet dark as we are assured by his disciple Possidius his forebodings were, his hopes for his religion and his race could not fail.

"One cannot think without sadness," says the French biographer Poujoulat, "of the images which must have embittered the last days of the bishop of Hippo, if the contemplation of the world invisible and imperishable had not softened them. *The City of the earth,* whose origin and vicissitudes Augustine had traced, appeared to him under very dismal aspects, and it is towards the City of God, of which he was also the Catholic Homer, that all his hopes were lifted. We however believe that a blessed light flashed across the night of his tribulation at his closing hour; we believe that Augustine, by the power of his genius and above all by a ray from on high, hailed the new world that was to spring from the old and doomed world, saw future ages receiving all their glory from the inspirations of Christianity, the East becoming young again and vivacious under the footsteps of barbarians, as nature is more brilliant and the air more pure after a storm, and finally the whole universe advancing to moral unity beneath the banner of the cross. This vision of the future was like a golden veil thrown over the earth then so deeply distracted." — Vol. iii. pp. 305–6.

He who wrote the City of God must, upon his death-bed, have believed in a power that would subdue the barbaric lion into obedience to the Lamb of God. History has by

no means altogether defeated the sublime anticipations of this great prophet of the Cross.

Thus passed away at the age of seventy-six, the renowned Augustine, the illustrious thinker of his age, and next to Athanasius the chief dictator of the creed of the Church.

It would be in place now to take a survey of the works, characteristics and influence of our saint, did time and the reader's patience allow. We must defer such a survey to another occasion, and pause from our task with a few words relating to the age of Augustine and the changes which have since passed over the world.

The work of M. Poujoulat recalls that age with remarkable vividness, and places it in striking connection with our own. He has not apparently added anything of value to the critical labors of Tillemont and the Benedictines, or of Neander and the German historians, although he has, he declares, faithfully perused the saint's entire works in the original, — no small task for an enthusiastic Frenchman, such as he shows himself to be. But he has done what no previous historian has done. He has visited the scenes of Augustine's life and labors, wrought them with great beauty into his narrative, and thus by a happy combination of the tourist and the antiquarian he has probably given far greater charm to his subject than mere scholarship, however vast, or philosophy, however profound, could possibly do. He is evidently very familiar with Augustine's various works, and gives an analysis of them in a very pleasing, popular style. His Roman orthodoxy does not permit him however to see the decided predestinarian notions of his author, nor to allow to Jansenius and Calvin any ground for laying claim to Augustine as an advocate of their views of human inability and divine election. He is obviously a warm devotee of the Roman Catholic Church, although not in priestly orders. He calls himself a man of the world, yet he must be a pretty strict confessor of the faith to be the favored protegé of the Archbishop of Paris, as his book denotes. There is considerably more of the Popish stamp upon the beginning and close, than on the main body of the work. Opposite the title-page is a poor lithograph of Murillo's picture of Saint Augustine and the angel, which represents a child-angel, with a shell in his hand, telling him

that it is as vain to try to solve the mystery of the Trinity as to try to empty the ocean with that shell. Then follows a patronizing letter from the Archbishop of Paris, and at the close of the third volume a long correspondence is appended, describing the pompous restoration to Africa of part of the remains of St. Augustine — the bones of the right arm, which by order of the Pope, and by an escort of bishops and priests, were taken from the Cathedral of Pavia in Italy, borne across the Mediterranean in the steamer Gassendi, and with solemn masses and processions deposited October 30, 1842, in the chapel of Bona, not far from the site of the saint's original tomb. The sacred relic was first carried to Augustine's monument, where imposing ceremonies were exhibited before a large and various crowd of Christians and Mahometans, soldiers and ecclesiastics. The monument, which has been recently erected, is an altar of white marble, and bears a bronze statue which looks towards the sea and that France "which now shows herself so worthy," says Poujoulat, "to reckon Augustine henceforth among her own children." The French nationality indicated in this last clause pervades M. Poujoulat's whole work. Yet he enters very fully into the spirit of Augustine, and by no means allows the patriotism of the Frenchman to hide the faith and charity of the Christian. His love for his author appears somewhat eloquently in a closing passage of his work: —

"In completing this work, something of sadness moves my heart. I am about to take leave of a good and excellent friend, with whom I have long held converse; my days and often my nights have been passed in listening to Saint Augustine, in interrogating his genius, in following him in the diversity of his thoughts and his cares; I have made myself his contemporary, his disciple, the witness of his labors and of his virtues, the companion of his footsteps through the world; and lo! now from year to year, from labor to labor, from conflicts to conflicts, I have seen this great man sink into the tomb, or rather ascend towards God! and these last pages are like perfumes borne to his tomb; and what I loved has vanished, and like the men of Galilee after the ascension of the divine Master, I stand still upon the mountain, and seek Saint Augustine in heaven! Of all the masters of religious science, the Bishop of Hippo is the one who has given me the best comprehension of Christianity, who has introduced me farthest into the invisible world. Grati-

tude has sometimes erected monuments sacred to memory; my hands are too feeble to build pyramids; all that I have been able to do, is to engrave upon a stone fragile as my days the great name of Saint Augustine, in remembrance of the benefit I have received." — Vol. iii. pp. 327–8.

We translate but two short passages more, which afford a good idea of the peculiar value of what he has done to give freshness to the biography of his hero. They contain a sketch of the present appearance of ancient Hippo.

"The fig-tree, the olive, and the apricot, meadows and harvests cover the pleasant declivities of Hippo and the whole space once occupied with habitations; nature has stretched its richest mantle over the sepulchre of the ancient city; vegetation has taken the place of a whole people, and when, pilgrim of history, I have trodden this illustrious soil, I have not heard the thousand sounds of a great city, but only the murmur of the Seybous, the song of birds hidden in the flowery thicket, and the prolonged lowing of cows guarded by a Moorish herdsman. This place in which Providence had placed a torch which was seen from the four corners of the world, I loved to behold thus decked with all the treasures of creation; I heard with joy the melodies of the nightingale at the place from which Augustine taught men harmonies divine and eternal."

"Seen from the rising ground of the Seybous, the high land of Hippo which we call the hill of Saint Augustine's monument presents outlines of infinite grace; it detaches itself from the plain by harmonious and gentle lines, whose expression is beyond description. This hill seems as if it had fallen from the hand of God to serve as a pedestal to the most profound thinker of Christian antiquity. It offers to the imagination something of the gracefulness that marks the proportions of Saint Augustine's genius. This man, who saw in creation as in the arts steps by which to ascend to God, was fitly placed upon the banks of the Seybous, in the midst of a charming country, in face of the sea, the Edough and the Atlas, and nature was undoubtedly one of his motives for loving his dear Hippo so fondly." —Vol. i. pp. 197–8: 202–3.

As we close our sketch with this vivid picture before us, we cannot but glance at the changes that have come over Christendom since Augustine's time. Could the legend, preserved by Gibbon, and told of seven young men in that age, who were said to have come forth alive from a cave at Ephesus, where they had been immured for death by the Pagan Emperor Decius, and whence they were said to have

emerged, awakened from nearly two centuries of slumber, to revisit the scenes of their youth and to behold with astonishment the cross displayed triumphant, where once the Ephesian Diana reigned supreme; — could this legend be virtually fulfilled in Augustine, dating the slumber from the period of his decease; could the great Latin Father have been saved from dissolution and have sunk into a deep sleep in the tomb where Possidius and his clerical companions laid him with solemn hymns and eucharistic sacrifice, while Genseric and his Vandals were storming the city gates; and could he but come forth in our day, and look upon our Christendom, would he not be more startled than were the seven sleepers of Ephesus? There indeed roll the waves of the same great sea; there gleam the waters of the river on which so many times he had gazed, musing upon its varied path from the Atlas mountains to the Mediterranean, full of lessons in human life; there stretches the landscape in its beauty, rich with the olive and the fig-tree, the citron and the jujube. But how changed all else. The ancient Numidia is ruled by the French, the countrymen of Martin and Hilary; it is the modern Algiers. Hippo is only a ruin, and near its site is the bustling manufacturing town of Bona. At Constantine, near by, still lingers a solitary church of the age of Constantine, and the only building to remind Augustine of the churches of his own day. In other places, as at Bona, the mosque has been converted into the Christian temple, and its mingled emblems might tell the astounded saint how the Cross had struggled with the Crescent, and how it had conquered. Go to whatever church he would on the 28th of August, he would hear a mass in commemoration of his death, and might learn that similar services were offered in every country under the sun and in the imperial language which he so loved to speak. Let him go westward to the sea-coast, and he finds the new city, Algiers, and if he arrived at a favorable time he might hear the cannon announcing the approach of the Marseilles steamer, see the people throng to the shore for the last French news, and thus contemplate at once the mighty agencies of the modern world, powder, print, and steam. Although full of amazement, it would not be all admiration. He would find little in the

motley population of Jews, Berbers, Moors, and French to console him for the absence of the loved people of his charge, whose graves not a stone would appear to mark.

Should he desire to know how modern men philosophized in reference to the topics that once distracted his Manichean period, he would find enough to interest and astonish him in the pages of Spinoza and Leibnitz, Swedenborg and Schelling; and would be no indifferent student of the metaphysical creeds of Descartes and Locke and Kant. Much of novelty would undoubtedly appear to him united with much familiar and ancient. Should he inquire into the state of theology through Christendom, in order to trace the influence of his favorite doctrines of original sin and elective grace, he would learn that they had never in their decided form been favorites with the Catholic Church, that the imperial mother had canonized his name and proscribed his peculiar creed, and that the principles that fell with the walls of the hallowed Port Royal have found their warmest advocates in Switzerland, in Scotland, and far America, beyond the Roman communion. He would recognise his mantle on the shoulders of Calvin of Geneva and his followers, Knox of Scotland, and those mighty Puritans who, trusting in God and his decreeing will, colonized our own New England, and brought with them a faith and virtue that have continued, while their stern dogmas have been considerably mitigated in the creed of their children. The Institutes of Calvin would assure him that the modern age possessed thinkers clear and strong as he, and the work of Edwards on the Will would probably move him to bow his head as before a dialectician of a logic more adamantine than his own, and make him yearn to visit the land of a divine who united an intellect so mighty with a spirit so humble and devoted. Should he come among us, he would find multitudes to respect his name and to accept his essential principles, though few, if any, to agree with him in his views of the doom of infants or of the limited offer of redemption. He would think much of our orthodoxy quite Pelagian, even when tested by the opinion of present champions of the ancient faith. In the pages of Channing he would think his old antagonist, Pelagius, revived, with renewed vigor, enlarged philosophy, and added eloquence. He might call this perhaps too fond champion

of the dignity of man by the name, Pelagius, — like him in doctrine, like him, as the name denotes, a dweller by the sea. Who shall say how much the influences of position helped to form the two champions of human nature, the ancient Briton and the modern New Englander, both in part at least of the same British race, both nursed by the sea-side, the one by the shores of Wales or Brittany, the other by the beach of Rhode Island. "No spot on earth," says Channing, "has helped to form me so much as that beach. There I lifted up my voice in praise amidst the tempest. There, softened by beauty, I poured out my thanksgiving and contrite confessions. There, in reverential sympathy with the mighty power around me, I became conscious of power within."

How long before the human soul shall reach so full a development, that faith and works, reason and authority, human ability and divine grace shall be deemed harmonious, and men cease to be divided by an Augustine and Pelagius or an Edwards and Channing? Although this consummation may not soon, if ever, be, and opinions may still differ, charity has gained somewhat in the lapse of centuries. Those who are usually considered the followers of Pelagius have been first to print a complete work of Augustine in America — his Confessions. The Roman Church, backed by imperial power and not checked by Augustine, drove the intrepid Briton into exile and an unknown grave. He who more than any other man wore his mantle of moral freedom in our age died, honored throughout Christendom, and the bell of a Romish cathedral joined in the requiem as his remains were borne through the thronged streets of the city of his home. S. O.

ART. II. — REV. JOHN ANDREWS D. D.

THE personal worth of this venerable man, as well as his position among the oldest of the fathers in the ministry, requires a tribute of respect to his memory in this journal. Dr. Andrews was born in Hingham, Mass., March 3, 1764. His father, Joseph Andrews, was a substantial farmer.

His mother was a daughter of Colonel Richmond, who as an officer in the royal army distinguished himself at the capture of Cape Breton. Dr. Andrews was the fourth son and sixth child of his parents. When quite a lad, he was apprenticed to Mr. Fleet, a printer in Boston; but his earnest desire to obtain a liberal education, induced his father to consent to his leaving Mr. Fleet at the end of the second year of his apprenticeship. He was fitted for College by the late Dr. Howard of Springfield, at that time a teacher in Hingham, and entered Harvard University July, 1782. He was graduated with honor in 1786, studied theology at Cambridge, and resided for two years as private tutor in the family of the late Chief Justice Dana. He soon received and accepted a call to settle as colleague with the Rev. Thomas Cary, (who was taken from his stated labors by a paralytic affection,) over the First Church in Newburyport, and was ordained December 10, 1788. On the 8th of September, 1789, he was married to Margaret, daughter of Dr. Edward Wigglesworth, Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College. Mr. Cary died November 24, 1808, and Dr. Andrews retained the sole charge of the parish until May 1, 1830, when he resigned his office: he continued, however, at the unanimous request of the church, to administer the ordinances until the settlement of his successor in August of the following year.* After his resignation Dr. Andrews preached occasionally to one or two societies in the vicinity of Newburyport. He officiated for the last time about two years since in his native town. His death took place at Newburyport on the 17th of last August, in his eighty-second year. In 1824 he received at Cambridge the honorary degree of D. D.

The First Church in Newburyport was at its formation a liberal church, as distinguished from the Calvinistic

* It will not be out of place to state here a fact or two in regard to the society over which Dr. Andrews was settled. The First Church in Newburyport (then the third in Newbury) was gathered January 12, 1726, and on the 19th of the same month Rev. John Lowell of Boston, a descendant of one of the early settlers of the town, and grandfather of the senior minister of the West Church in this city, was ordained as its first pastor. The ministries of Mr. Lowell, Mr. Cary, and Dr. Andrews covered a period of more than a century. The successor of Dr. Andrews a few years since attended in his company the funeral of an aged lady, (the relict of the late Dr. Sawyer,) who was married by Mr. Lowell, and had been a member of the society under all four of its ministers.

churches in its neighborhood, and such it has remained to the present day. Dr. Andrews in his opinions, like his predecessors, would be classed among those now known as Unitarians. He abhorred all exclusiveness, and owned no creed but the Bible. During the earlier years of his ministry there were several clergymen in the north part of Essex county who agreed with him in his anti-Calvinistic views, and until towards the close of his professional life he freely exchanged pulpit services with all the Congregational ministers in the town and vicinity. His hair had become gray and he was numbered among the elders, before he was shut out from the so called orthodox churches. As a preacher, Dr. Andrews touched but seldom on controverted topics, preferring to confine himself, as by far the most important, to more practical subjects. His sermons were popular in his day; and his services in the pulpit more than usually acceptable, both at home and abroad. He was called upon to preach the Dudleian Lecture, and to deliver several occasional discourses which were published. One of his printed performances was a Eulogy on the death of President Washington, whom he regarded with enthusiastic reverence, heightened by the fact that among his early patrons and friends were several of the prominent actors in the Revolution. For fifty years Dr. Andrews was a Trustee, and for half that time the accurate and punctual Treasurer of Dummer Academy. He was one of the delegates from Newburyport in the Convention for revising the Constitution of this State.

But his life as a whole was without striking incidents, and was spent almost entirely within the limits of his own parish, in the unostentatious, faithful performance of the duties of the ministry; in the enjoyment of the friendship of some of the most eminent men among his contemporaries, and of the well-deserved respect of a large, intelligent and harmonious congregation. Unaffected in his manners, generous in his hospitality, charitable to the destitute, warm in his affections, unbending in his integrity, strong in his religious principles and Christian faith, Dr. Andrews has left behind him the memory of a pure and upright character. He belonged to a generation of men of whom but very few remain among us, — living witnesses to the stirring and critical events which marked the infancy of our

republic. His opinions and prejudices were those prevalent among intelligent and good men in the days of his youth; and they remained fixed and firm to the last. His habits were exact and systematic. The useful and time-saving virtue of punctuality he carried almost to excess. In all his dealings and doings he was a "minute man;" and it may be doubted, whether on any occasion he was ever known to be tardy. He felt and expressed warm affection and solicitude for the welfare of the University at which he was graduated, almost to the day of his death. When he seemed unconscious of their presence, and unable to recognise old and familiar friends, he would make repeated and pertinent inquiries as to the state of the questions agitated concerning Harvard College.

Dr. Andrews met with severe bereavements. Kindred and friends fell at his side until he stood almost alone. Besides a beautiful child who died in infancy, he lost under very trying circumstances his eldest son, soon after he had entered the Christian ministry with bright promise of usefulness and success, and in the evening of his days he parted with the wife of his youth, for many years the sharer of his sorrows and his joys, tenderly beloved and sincerely mourned. His resignation under these trials showed that he could calmly practise the submission he preached as a Christian duty. Another cross he also bore with meekness and patience. It is difficult for an aged minister to perceive and admit, when, on account of his infirmities or changes in the tastes of society, the time has arrived for his retirement from office. The force of habit, the consciousness of an unimpaired interest in his work, and the continued esteem and confidence of the early friends who may still remain among his parishioners, all conspire to make him reluctant to leave the field in which he has so long labored. To be willing to resign his place, and that too gracefully and with Christian meekness, is evidence of a right and religious temper. All who knew Dr. Andrews will bear witness, that he left the pulpit for the pew in a way to command respect, and set a bright example; that the faithful pastor, when circumstances demanded, became the excellent parishioner, interested to the last in the welfare of the congregation, of which for more than fourscore years he had been a pastor.

As evidence of the unaffected humility of Dr. Andrews, and also to show how strong to the last was his faith in the favorite truth, of which he was never weary of hearing or speaking — the reunion in a future world of those most dear in this, we may mention the fact, that he left written directions to have his funeral conducted with the greatest simplicity, and also an inscription for his grave-stone. This inscription, after giving his name and the usual dates, concluded thus: —

"He cherished the fond hope, of meeting in the heavenly world the beloved friends who had gone before him.

> There thy bright train, immortal friendship, soar,
> No more to part, to mingle tears no more."

Dr. Andrews was not a great man, — a man of shining and brilliant qualities; but he was emphatically a good man, — a good Christian man, one who used his talents in the right way, and endeavored always, and in all relations, to do his duty with fidelity and according to the dictates of an honest conscience. His long life was without contention, and none ever doubted the entire honesty and purity of his purposes. To be able to say this, to be able to say that his was a heart that might have been laid open to the world without a fear that anything unworthy would be found therein, is to be able to say a great deal. No greater honor need be desired than that which can safely be claimed for our venerable friend: for we can stand by his grave and say without qualification, "Here lies the dust of one, who 'in simplicity and godly sincerity had his conversation in the world;' one who went to his fathers in peace, and was buried in a good old age; one whose days on earth were the days of the upright."

The writer of this imperfect notice knows that after the mental faculties of the venerable subject of it were weakened, and something of second childhood had come upon him, his religious trust remained firm, and his religious hope bright. He spoke from time to time more calmly of his own departure from earth, which he felt was near, than upon almost any other topic. Death had for him no terrors: he was rather anxious to go hence. He has gone to his reward, and left a good name as a rich legacy to those who mourn his loss. T. B. F.

Art. III. — NEW HYMN BOOKS.*

This large array of Hymn Books, most of them very recent, and some just from the press, certainly indicate an unusual attention to one of the most popular departments of sacred literature, and one of the most interesting helps of social worship. We must admit that it indicates something more, — a want of perfect satisfaction with any Collections heretofore in use. In both these respects it reminds us of the Collections of church music, which have lately been multiplied in a corresponding manner, to meet new wants in our religious congregations. With respect to these latter, however, we cannot but suspect that the interests and peculiar tastes of the compilers have had at least as much influence in promoting the enterprise, as any wishes of the people. We cannot help looking with some mistrust on rapid successions of works of psalmody from precisely the same hands, and feeling that the spirit of fickleness or of trade may have had too great a share in them. It is true, that some excellent new tunes are thus

---

* 1. *Christian Hymns for Public and Private Worship.* A Collection compiled by a Committee of the Cheshire Pastoral Association. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 16mo. pp. 454.

2. *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for the Sanctuary.* Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 586.

3. *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Social and Private Worship.* Revised Edition. With Supplement. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 520.

4. *Hymns for Public Worship.* Boston: Andrews, Prentiss & Studley. 1845. 16mo. pp. 416.

5. *A Manual of Prayer, for Public and Private Worship, with a Collection of Hymns.* Second Edition. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 394.

6. *The Psalmist: A new Collection of Hymns for the use of the Baptist Churches.* By Baron Stow and S. F. Smith. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1845. 16mo. pp. 784.

7. *Psalms and Hymns, for Christian Use and Worship;* prepared and set forth by the General Association of Connecticut. New Haven: Durrie & Peck. 1845. 16mo. pp. 720.

8. *Church Psalmist: or Psalms and Hymns, for the Public, Social, and Private Use of Evangelical Christians.* Fifth Edition. New York: Mark H. Newman. 1845. 16mo. pp. 653.

9. *Hymns and Anthems.* London: 1841. 16mo. pp. 120.

added to the common stock; and what is still better, some fine old cathedral strains have been awakened from their long silence to inspire the devotions of modern assemblies. It is true, also, that some varieties of measure and tone unknown to former choirs were needed, to bring into vocal expression the fresh stores of sacred poetry, and to match with the demands that the prevailing use of the organ has introduced into our churches. We do not say that great improvements have not been made in this branch of a divine art, by what has been lately and so abundantly published. We believe that there have. At the same time, we have found something confounding in the accumulation of books of this description. We have watched with no little uneasiness the capricious changes that they have encouraged. We have seen the evils that altered harmonies, changes uncalled for, different pieces under the same names, and the distractions of an almost endless variety, can hardly fail to produce. This will not seem a long digression from the subject we have taken in hand, or indeed hardly a digression at all, if we consider the intimate relation that exists between the words of a hymn, and its musical effect in the tune that has to be adapted to it. We ought to remember, what the compilers of hymn books are very apt to forget, that a hymn is not a copy of irregular lines, that may be clogged with consonants, or broken up with pauses, or stifled with syllables but half vocal, or set on with uneven feet, according to the writer's pleasure. It is not written to be read alone, and by the eye merely, or to be declaimed with the freedom of rhetoric. It is a melodious composition, that should almost sing itself; confined within rhythmical laws of its own, and to be chorally represented. The old masters of holy verse were more attentive to this important point than their successors have for the most part been.

But let us return to the class of books more directly under our review; especially to those examples of it, which we have placed at the head of this article, and thus bound ourselves to give at least some imperfect account of. On surveying their number, our first impulse was to be glad that so much attention had been given to the good work, and that so many differing voices had been called out to praise God and Christ. There is no danger, no objection

here, of the kind just mentioned. Each hymn book stands single in the society that has adopted it, undisturbed by any divisions or discords. It is almost sure to remain long enough to secure the attachment of those to whom it has grown familiar. It is not likely, at least at the present time, to be an object of pecuniary speculation, or to be touched by any but the highest motives. The most successful compiler can scarcely expect that his labors will travel far beyond those for whose benefit they were prepared. Our congregations are generally slow to encourage changes. Economy, as well as habit and revering associations, will tend to keep them in the use of what is already in their possession. Nevertheless, circumstances are continually arising that make innovations desirable. Hymn books will fall out of print, as they insensibly decline from the estimation in which they were at first held. New societies are forming, that have only to select the one that shall recommend itself the best to their preference. Different religious views, and not only these, but different impressions of the sentiment that a hymn should most suitably convey, will lead to a choice in conformity to them. There can be no doubt, moreover, that improvement will follow in the train of successive attempts. Better arrangements may take the place of those that now seem good enough. A richer copiousness or a more perfect selectness may be exhibited than has ever been yet. Some pieces, even, of the elder day may be presented with more force and beauty, while constant accessions of devout strains, from that fountain of the spirit which is always flowing, will pour their tribute into future repositories and perhaps constitute their chief glory. We believe in progress. The best has not come, and we shall never see it come. Meanwhile, let us receive with courtesy every candidate for so holy an office as that of leading this part of our devotions, examine his claims with candor and discernment, and neither think that the work requires to be hurried nor that it can ever be done.

With these views, we rejoiced, as we have said, to see so large a company coming forward, bringing the results of their industry and taste to a good cause, and into fair competition for public favor. We do not know that this gratification has been materially abated by an examination of

the works themselves. They all have merit, and each one has some point of advantage which it is entitled to claim as peculiarly its own. We were occasionally inclined, indeed, to raise a question, whether this were a well-chosen time to multiply Hymn Books to such an extent, when Dr. Bowring is so busy, and Mr. Montgomery, though he has written several pieces that are eminently good, is enjoying a degree of reputation which we do not think he will permanently retain. This objection, however, seemed to press with less weight, as we thought to make it of very serious importance. Another preliminary question crossed our minds from the circumstance, that but a short time has elapsed since the publication of the "Christian Psalter," of which an extended and most favorable notice appeared in the Monthly Miscellany so lately as March, 1842. But we considered the difficulty, if not impossibility, of satisfying all with the same performance. We considered the manifold wants of different congregations. It ought also to be taken into account, that many of our societies have become attached to the Collections that they have had long in use, and prefer making them the basis of an enlarged edition, to introducing an entirely new work. This cause will be seen to have contributed to make the number here before us so large as it is. Nor had it been inactive before, as one or two remarkable instances remind us. This was the case with the excellent though disjointed Collection used by the Church in Brattle Square, which bears upon it the labors, though not the names, of two distinguished pastors, Buckminster and Palfrey, and of which the second edition was issued only ten years ago. It is true also of the very inferior one — as we are compelled to regard it — of the West Church, which appeared in 1823.

Having thus alluded to former endeavors, we hope not to be thought tedious nor to speak irrelevantly, if we review a little what has been otherwise done by our denomination in this department. Fifty years ago, an insensible change of religious views had rendered offensive many of the doctrinal expressions that abound in the writings of Dr. Watts, some of which he would not himself have consented to utter in the latter part of his life. Dr. Belknap, aided silently by Dr. Clarke, then published his "Sacred Poetry," which was received with great approbation and widely

circulated. With the power of its miscellaneous novelty, it displaced, though not so rapidly as we should have supposed, the strong work of that one master-hand. In 1812 a small supplement of twenty-eight hymns was added to it, without increasing in any considerable degree its usefulness, and in this form it continued unchanged, though often reprinted. The book had, however, several grave and essential faults, some of which were pointed out with a sharp criticism in the Christian Disciple of 1821, by the compiler, as we believe, of one of the works now brought under our notice. About that time, appeared the New York and Andover Collections, which were both reviewed together in the same volume of the Disciple that has just been named. The first of these, though executed with taste and ability, did not spread itself very extensively beyond the church for whose benefit it was originally designed. The second, Mr. Dabney's, if it did not win more praise, found more acceptance. In its original form, and afterwards in an enlarged and improved one, it made its way pretty successfully among our congregations, where it still maintains a place. Nevertheless, there was nothing as yet to take the stand of favor, from which Belknap's Collection had irretrievably fallen. In this state of things, Dr. Greenwood of King's Chapel came forward to supply an acknowledged deficiency, and in 1830 published his "Psalms and Hymns for Christian Worship." The book attained at once to an extraordinary success, that was owing both to its real merit and to the beautiful fame of its author. When it came to the sixteenth edition, it was amended by a supplement and by the substitution of a few hymns for others, no further changes being contemplated, and we see it now arrived at its forty-first edition, and introduced into the service of more than seventy worshipping assemblies. This was certainly a great deal to accomplish. But there did not long remain a perfect content. Choirs complained that too many of the pieces could not be easily presented with good musical expression; and preachers thought that they discovered after a time some lack of variety in the topics, and some difficulty in finding such as would correspond to the sentiment of their discourses. Thus it came to be supposed by many, that the book was rather a rich and tasteful repository of sacred verse, than adapted to the

popular want and to constant use. These alleged defects we do not conceive to be altogether imaginary. We are disposed to ascribe to them, more than to any other cause, the great disposition that has been shown to try for something better. We ought not forget, meanwhile, to mention two other works that were nearly contemporary with this,—Dr. Willard's "Hymns," and the Springfield Collection. In the first of these, which was printed in the same year, the venerable author was so governed by his favorite idea of producing "an invariable coincidence between the poetic and the musical emphases," as to sacrifice to it almost everything else, and leave but little emphasis to the poetry. The other, the faithful labor of an accomplished mind, committed a great error, as it always seemed to us, in the unlimited freedom which it allowed itself of altering at pleasure its originals. The "Christian Psalter" of Mr. Lunt may be regarded as the first attempt to meet what seemed to be a new want. He adopted the improvements that had been introduced by his predecessors. He adhered scrupulously to the language of the writers from whom he borrowed, restoring it as far as possible where it had suffered changes. He presented a tabular reference to the Book of Psalms on a single page, instead of breaking up the unity of the whole, and disturbing the arrangement of the parts, by the needless division into psalms and hymns. This was formerly the universal custom, and is retained by two of the three performances not of our denomination, of which the titles are annexed,—that of the General Association of Connecticut, and that "for the use of Evangelical Christians." His method is the most perfect that we have anywhere seen, simple but yet ingenious, novel but natural at the same time, enabling us to turn at once to the subject we are seeking. His judgment has led him to prefer the bold strains and strong Scriptural imagery of the early masters in the art, to the flow, if more graceful, of modern numbers. We are inclined to think that this has given to the "Psalter" an antique air, which, while it is admired by some, fails to commend itself to the choice of others. Hence in part that anxiety to provide further means, which is indicated plainly enough by the occasion of this article.

And this leads us to a general remark, that may as well

be made now. In the latest of the Collections that have been prepared for those churches with which we are associated, we have been struck with the comparatively small number of old hymns. Mr. Ellis's, for instance, has but 110 from Watts, and 60 from Doddridge; and that of the Cheshire Pastoral Association, with 908 pieces, has adopted only 119 from Watts and 47 from Doddridge; while the "Psalter" contains 264 from the chief of that famous duumvirate, and 105 from the other. This fact of itself displays a tendency, much increased of late, not only to welcome worthy new-comers, which should by all means be done, but to make less account of ancient friends; — to change indeed the general character of our church poetry. This may be best, but there will be many who cannot think so, and to whom there is an inexpressible charm in the finest specimens of what has been the longest familiar. An honored antiquity carries something of a title in its own right, especially in matters of this kind. It can make quaint words reverend, and animate common words with a power beyond themselves. This is shown by frequent experience. No doubt the hearts of the followers of the new reformer, John Ronge, are cheered beyond measure, when they intonate the 46th psalm in Father Luther's version. The mere student may feel the force of the same or a like principle, in going back to the Latin hymns of the middle ages. The clang of the old monkish rhymes sounds in his imagination like the bells from some gray abbey or cathedral tower. In three short lines,

> "Lignum crucis,
> Signum ducis,
> Sequitur exercitus,"

he hears the whole history of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that followed. He connects in his mind, and with some reason too, such unpolished strains with the wonders of sculpture and painting that seemed to imitate their spirit. Who can tell what influence the "Dies iræ" may have actually exerted on Michael Angelo's famous fresco of the Last Judgment? Of how many a Madonna and Pietà may the "Stabat mater dolorosa" have been the type! And when he reads their frequent themes of the shortness of life and the vanity of the world, as set forth in the lines of Bernard of Clairvaux,

"Terram teris, terram geris,
Et in terram reverteris,
Qui de terra sumeris.
Cerne quid es, et quid eris;
Modo flos es, et verteris
In favillam cineris,"

he feels that, though he may translate them in their full and exact chime, they lose their peculiar effect in another tongue;—

Earth thou wearest, earth thou bearest,
And to earth thou fast repairest,
Who from earth wast taken.
What art thou? and whither farest?
But a flower, — and, though the rarest,
Shalt to dust be shaken.

But to return to our retrospect. In the year 1836, a Collection of Hymns was prepared for the worshippers at the Warren Street and Pitts Street Chapels, by Messrs. Barnard, Gray and Weston. It was modestly offered to the public in a simple and cheap form, under the idea that it might prove acceptable in Sunday schools and some of our smaller churches. This hope was not disappointed, as we have now before us the fifth edition of it, with nearly fifty Hymns added. It is exceedingly well adapted to the end for which it was designed, showing good judgment and a true spirit. With a similar purpose, in 1843, Rev. Chandler Robbins brought forward his "Social Hymn-Book," intended "for vestry meetings, and for parishes that are unable to procure more expensive Collections." It abounds with devotional feeling. Nothing seems to have been admitted into it, without having first passed slowly not only before the critical eyes but over the heart of the compiler. It misses, to its loss, two pieces of his own, that are printed in the "Hymns for the Sanctuary;" and since he has borrowed so largely from Ancient Hymns, we are a little sorry that he overlooked the very best in the Breviary. It is adopted in almost all the recent publications. Its closing verse we cannot refrain from quoting, as almost a model of style for this kind of composition:

"O righteous Judge! if thou wilt deign
To grant us what we need,
We pray for time to turn again,
And grace to turn indeed."

The same year, Dr. Flint of Salem issued his "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home," in compliance with a vote of the society, of which he is the pastor. They were desirous of retaining as many hymns as possible of the little Collection that had been heretofore in use, drawn up by Dr. Bentley, his learned predecessor. The facility that is thus furnished for one's task is not wholly without its disadvantage; since, in seeking to please the accustomed ear of parishioners, or to show respect for what has been done before by a revered hand, one is tempted to preserve the pieces that are thought worthy of preservation, rather in the form that is best remembered, than in that which is really the best. Such may have been the case with some of these, as the 290th and 306th. Happily, however, they were for the most part printed correctly at first, few liberties having been taken with the text. We think that Dr. Flint has executed his commission well, and produced what may be valued far beyond the circle of his own charge. Two pieces by Sterling, 221 and 312, we have never seen anywhere else; and we name them as representing a class, that we do not consider it desirable to multiply; being written in a hard style, and without sufficient adaptation either to the powers of a choir or the circumstances of an audience. We are afraid that a still heavier objection would lie against one by Burns, 219, where the penitent seems to us to be rather palliating his sin, than crying for mercy. But we can sincerely say on the whole, that if we were among those who are to have the advantage of sitting under the ministerial instructions of Dr. Flint, we should be perfectly contented and happy to carry into the new church, which we hope will soon be auspiciously consecrated, this book that is to lead a part of its devotions. — Something over a year ago came out a "Service Book, for the use of the Church of the Disciples." A Collection of 381 Hymns constituted a part of it, and an excellent part. The compiler enters on his task with the artless confession, that "of making many Hymn Books there is no end." He tells us that he has been guided by "a principle of omission rather than of selection;" aiming "not at a variety of thought, but at a fulness of sentiment." He has happily attained the object he sought. He has edited a book of no.

common stamp, which every lover of ecclesiastical poetry will find profit and delight in reading.

It is now time to confine our attention to the particular works of which we proposed to give some account. The preliminary remarks that we have offered, if rather long in comparison with all the rest that our limits will allow us to say, have not, we hope, been irrelevant, as they will serve to point out the general rules by which our judgment has been guided.

The first on our list is that compiled by Rev. Messrs. Livermore, Leonard, Whitwell and Cutler, on behalf of the Cheshire Pastoral Association. It has the merit of great copiousness. It comprises within an exceedingly moderate compass an unusually large number of pieces, in the most various styles, and suited to every subject. It abounds, more than any other with which we are acquainted, in pieces that are intended to meet particular occasions. In these ways it is both rich and cheap. Its materials have been gathered together with the utmost diligence, as may be seen by a glance at the catalogue of its contributors. Every one may find his friends there, good friends too, and some whose names are not apt to figure in such a connexion. We have been surprised at the range that it has taken, and the excellent gleanings it has contrived to find where we had supposed the whole harvest to be over. We must acknowledge that we felt some regret at missing, in the midst of such abundance, not a few of our chief old favorites. Tate and Brady are allowed to appear in it but nine times. If we were disposed to find any fault, it would be with what is likely to recommend it to many, the modern air that everywhere surrounds it. Even where we have been attracted with some show of antiquity, the promise was not always kept; Milton's portion of "No war nor battle's sound" ceasing entirely with the first stanza, and all the rest but poorly conforming to that grand outset. Still, it is full of spirit and of good things. It is destined, we doubt not, to a large share of popularity. It deserves to have it. We hope to see this prediction of ours fulfilled.*

Of Mr. Ellis's "Collection of Psalms and Hymns for the

* Even while we are writing, this prophecy seems about coming to pass. A new edition, and that the fourth, just appears from the press, in larger type and a handsomer form.

Sanctuary" we should be glad to say more than the limits of these notices will permit. It is larger and sightlier than that just spoken of, though instead of 908 hymns it contains but 658. It is preceded by very considerable selections from the Psalms, so arranged as to be chanted by the choir, or to be read and sung responsively; in which case the minister and people on one side, and the music on the other, take up alternate verses. This we look upon as a beautiful addition, if it can be successfully put in use. The compiler has given us an account of the principles that guided him, in a manly preface, the spirit of which we heartily accord with, though it puts in its claim for a latitude in making alterations, which we can with difficulty admit. Indeed, this latitude has led to what we cannot but consider a blemish in his excellent book. It departs too often and widely, as we think, from the original authors. This may be owing chiefly to the fact, that it was prepared to take the place of the Springfield Collection, now out of print, in the Harvard church. It naturally adopted much from it, and as naturally accepted it in the same form in which it found it; and that, as was remarked above, was far from allowing the poet to speak for himself. One may perceive, even from a slight examination of it, that, though it has selected its contents from the most various quarters, it has drawn from two main sources of supply. These are the Collection just named and that of Dr. Greenwood, who on the contrary imposed upon himself pretty rigorously the rule, to alter as little as possible, and to have every hymn "really the production of the individual whose name is placed over it." This rule was adhered to in the Christian Psalter with a still more scrupulous tenacity, and it appears to us to be a just one. Not that we would have it so inviolable as never to be broken. Good as it is, it may be overstrained. But it should prevent such representations of Watts as we find, for example, at 464. And now that we have named again that great psalmist, we feel obliged to say that we have looked in vain in this Collection for some of his verses that we have been accustomed to prize as among the best. For these, and the like of them, we would gladly give up such pieces as 177, Bowring's, 276, Milman's, 533, Montgomery's, 178, H. K. White's, and

especially 491, Hutton's, where the "flowers of Lebanon decay" under the rebuke of Jehovah,

"Which bids the rocks to overturn."

Lest we should seem to be in the vein of fault-finding, we will sum up at once all we have to say of this kind, and turn to the pleasanter part of our duty. We are of opinion, then, that a greater share of attention might usefully have been given to the question of fitness for being sung; since many a beautiful devotional poem that delights in the closet, is wholly unavailable for the church. We have thought also, that there were more pieces than we could desire of a descriptive character, and of those that seem rather to preach than to worship. In the future copies, which we hope will be a great many, we would venture to suggest that a tabular index to the Psalms would be a convenient addition. Meanwhile, let us make haste to declare that there is no one of the books, whose titles are copied above, that we are ready to prefer to this. It contains about sixty pieces, that were quite new to us, and many of them well worthy to shine anywhere. No other has presented Milton to us so nobly. Take for instance the 51st and the glorious 291st, that make the heart bound at them. The 238th also, the famous "nativity," we have here in that altered form, but yet of truly Miltonic cast, for which we presume we are indebted to Dr. Peabody of Springfield. We should like to dwell longer in commendation, but are admonished that our space is becoming narrow.

A revised edition of the New York Hymn Book, with a Supplement, appears after an interval of exactly a quarter of a century. We had something to say at that time of what we considered to be the merits of the first edition, and these are certainly much increased in the new one. The forty hymns that have been substituted in the place of as many taken out, are improvements, without a single exception. The few alterations that have been made have been very judiciously done, as we are glad to exemplify in the old 100th psalm, which is here brought back to its primitive form and power. One does not easily amend the phraseology of Watts; who deserves, we have often thought, the expression that Homer loves to employ in speaking of his gods and heroes, calling them not simply Hercules or

Menelaus, but *the force* of Hercules and Menelaus. The Supplement, consisting of one hundred and forty-six hymns, has been made up, according to our judgment, in excellent taste. We ought to acknowledge, therefore, that we have in this an admirable volume. At the same time it is exceedingly injured for the pulpit by disposing its contents in the very worst method that was ever devised, the alphabetical one. As each part is distributed into three divisions, here are six several courses of the alphabet, according to the initial letter of each first line. We are afraid that nothing can perfectly redeem such a mistake. We are not able to agree with our friend, the compiler, — we wish with all our heart we could, — that the new indexes, though we are thankful for them, can obviate all the inconveniences that arise from so artificial an arrangement.

Next in order comes a "Selection of Hymns" by Rev. Mr. Briggs of Plymouth. He tells us in his preface that his object is "to bring together the most fervent expressions of a profound spiritual life;" and he has planned his arrangement in conformity to such a design, making it "represent as far as possible the different steps in the progress of the spiritual life." After such an exposition of his views, we should know in general what to expect; and when we find that 74 hymns out of the 601 are from the Wesleys and Wesleyans, we may gain some insight of the manner in which that expectation is to be fulfilled. We feel obliged to him for introducing to us so many spirited and affecting expressions of a devout soul, many of which we had never seen before; and some, for which we do not know now to whom we are obliged. At the same time we must acknowledge that he seems to us to have placed himself too much under the dominion of a single set of ideas. We cannot altogether approve the method that he has chosen, for the very reason that it follows those ideas out so faithfully. Abounding as his book does in spiritual graces, we doubt whether it has that variety which is wanted to make it wear well. Too great a portion of it is marked with the same character. We want the relief of change. Anything like monotony is dangerous in a work that is to stand public use from week to week. It is like passing from one house to another, and continually finding almost the same company, which may grow wearisome, however excel-

lent it may be. We repeat that we admire the spirit that breathes and kindles over the whole, but it wants more tongues; it is not "many-voiced" enough for us. Mrs. Hemans and Mr. Keble, and other favorite authors of the editor, though they are favorites with us also, appear rather too often. We will only add that the singers are likely to be sometimes perplexed in performing their part of the duty that a new hymn-book brings with it. They could scarcely get along with the 321st, in which the last line of the first verse falls two syllables short of the appointed measure. In mentioning this, however, we ought to add, in justice to the writer of that hymn, that it appears both in the Cheshire Collection and that of Mr. Ellis not only without that defect, but otherwise greatly improved.

Mr. Eliot, of St. Louis in Missouri, who, though so far from us, has his praise in all our churches, published in 1842 a Manual of Prayer for public and private worship, with a small Collection of 65 hymns appended. We welcome now a second edition, of twice the dimensions of the first. The ritual part remains the same as before, but the number of hymns is extended to 272. And they are good hymns, well and discreetly chosen from a great variety of writers, and conveniently disposed. We heartily wish that this service-book for the churches may be introduced into a great many of them, both in the West and the East. We are well aware that a liturgy has sometimes been jocosely called a lethargy; and we have been told by those with whom we are most apt to agree in opinion, that the form of prayer kills the preaching. We admit that there is a danger here, but we deny that there is a doom. We are sure that it has not killed or even hurt *his* preaching, and we give a welcome to his book. Its liturgy, — and we rather like one, — cannot but be useful in the cause of religion, wherever it is read. Its sacred poetry is suited to lift up the heart with the voice, wherever sung. By combining the two in one volume, it presents together all that is necessary for the comely and effective conducting both of general and family worship. In addition to the whole, are Selections from the Psalms of David, arranged for responses or chanting. These are precisely the same that we have spoken of before in connexion with the "Hymns for the Sanctuary."

We come now to three books, in which we may be supposed to take less interest. They belong to denominations, that are kindred to each other, but separate from us. As we open them, we cannot but be struck with the different impression that is made upon us. The air about us seems to grow heavy, and we walk in a light that has changed color and is suffering something like an eclipse. Nothing convinces us more than this contrast does of the diversity, in taste as well as opinion, between Christian truth as we receive it, and as it is embraced by our brethren who are called orthodox. These three works resemble each other closely in several respects. They are all inordinately large. The Baptist Collection, the "Psalmist," numbers 1180 pieces, besides the doxologies, and 52 more for chanting. We cannot count them so easily in the other two, as they do not run continuously, but are distinguished into psalms and hymns. The books, however, are at least as thick, one containing 652, and the other upwards of 700 closely printed pages. They all have this feature in common, that they are neither of them the achievement of a single hand, nor do they come before the world simply on their own responsibility. One owes itself to a "Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S."; another to the "General Association of Connecticut"; and the other, though independently prepared by Rev. Messrs. Stow and Smith, appears under the sanction of the "Board of Directors of the American Baptist Publication and Sunday School Society." They all present themselves, therefore, with some authority. Nine Baptist clergymen, from South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Ohio, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and New York, have examined and recommended the "Psalmist," and a fac-simile of their signatures is attached to their certificate. Five distinguished names from our sister State are affixed in like form to the preface of the "General Association." The "Church Psalmist," of which this is the fifth edition, shows no less than fifteen names, some of them quite celebrated, appended to its "Advertisement." These, however, are but accidents, though accidents that have a certain alliance together; for books could hardly fail to be large, that were to meet the wishes, and suggestions too, of so great a number of persons. They are alike, however, in other ways. They all assign a

particular department for the worship of "the Trinity," which is certainly a doctrine of inference merely where it is acknowledged to be true, and which the highest orthodoxy, that can be satisfied with the Scriptures, does not pretend to find under that generic title. They all adopt a style of expression concerning sacrifice and atonement, which, though much softened from what it was, has still a repulsive sound to our ears. That offensive hymn of Cowper, for instance, beginning,

> "There is a fountain fill'd with blood,
> Drawn from Immanuel's veins,"

is not wanting in either of them. They all allow themselves in representations of Providence and man that are little consistent with our habits of thought. And yet it has been very gratifying to see what improvement they have made in these respects beyond the ancient times. We find nothing near so harsh as we had to bear formerly. Not one of these compilations brings before the present public those enormities of Watts, that used to harrow former generations. Not one ventures to touch the terrible hymn that begins,

> "My thoughts on awful subjects roll,
> Damnation and the dead."

Not one retains any portion of that, of which the first verse is,

> "Well, the Redeemer's gone
> T' appear before our God,
> To sprinkle o'er the flaming throne
> With his atoning blood."

Not one, in describing the divine judgments, has anything the least resembling the ferocious hymn, the 44th of the 2d book, which we dare do no more than thus point at. Even,

> "Blood has a voice to pierce the skies,"

is nowhere found, but has given place to milder expositions, even if it be of the same doctrine. We rejoice to pay this just commendation. We rejoice still more, that in paying it we recognize the progress that is making in a true religious refinement in all quarters. We ascribe this progress in a great degree to the theological institutions and the means of general instruction, which are everywhere encouraged.

Learning is honored in sects that once strove to be independent of it. Sacred studies are pursued in companionship, and with the lights of the world around them, and so lose the scholasticism of the cloister. They mingle with the literature of the time, and the science that is above the prejudice or fashions of any time; with the philosophy of beauty, and the reverence of art; and so shoot out into a free and graceful culture. We do not feel called upon to express any opinion as to the relative merits of these three books. It might not seem sufficiently modest; and more than that, it would not be very easy. We are persuaded, that they are all a great deal better than what has been displaced to make room for them. We have no doubt that they will satisfy entirely the wants of the congregations, for which they have severally been prepared. The Baptist Collection enjoys an advantage in having one of its compilers himself a poet, who is held in estimation beyond the borders of his own sect. No less than nine of his hymns have been introduced into the full ranks of the Committee of the Cheshire Pastoral Association. We may add, that it has gathered its ingredients with at least as liberal a search and culling as its companions. We have even thought that it owed something to the influences of the neighborhood in which it was produced.

The little book called "Hymns and Anthems" stands in strange contrast with its somewhat clumsy associates just noticed. It is indeed a little one, containing but one hundred and fifty pieces, and those for the most part of extreme brevity, some of them literally but three or four lines long. It is delicately printed too, after the newest English fashion. It may be thought scarcely to come within the fair scope of our present article, being a foreigner and four years old. But it has some interest for us, as having been made for the chapel of the celebrated W. J. Fox of London; and besides this, it possesses a character that is peculiarly its own. It departs widely from all that we have been accustomed to consider as the proprieties of a hymn-book. It is composed of rhymes, blank verse, and plain prose. Among its contributors we find Goethe and the Prophet Habakkuk, St. Gregory and Lord Morpeth, St. John and Lord Byron, King David and Percy B. Shelley. Lines from Shakspeare's Tempest are found on the same page with lines from Alfred

Tennyson. The Roman Breviary and Coleridge's Ancient Mariner alike bring something to its net. Some of our own poets are there, — Bryant, Longfellow, Pierpont, Bulfinch and W. B. O. Peabody. It is certainly none the worse, but all the better for these. We do not know that we can say so much for 123, which begins:

"Britain's first poet,
Famous old Chaucer,
Swan-like in dying
Sung his last song,
When at his heart-strings
Death's hand was strong."

With all this, it is not so altogether an oddity as our readers might fancy from our description. We have read in it some charming things, that we would rather see here than not see at all. Several of these gems are by Mr. Fox himself, Robert Nicoll, Ebenezer Elliot and Miss Sarah F. Adams. The choicest of them may be found set among the brilliants, or rather the pearls, of the "Disciples' Hymn Book," to which we referred just now. What can be finer in its kind than the concluding piece, by the minister of Finsbury Chapel?

"Call them from the dead
For our eyes to see?"

In fact, we should love it exceedingly, if it were only called Sacred Jewelry, and kept upon the parlor table. As it is, we fear that it indicates an apostasy, more serious than its own, from ancient ideas and the consecrated forms of worship. It is divided into two "books," for what reason we know not, since the pieces are numbered in sequence, and flow on without much attempt at order. We surmise, however, as the cause, that when the work was printed, only the first half of it had been furnished with music; for there was an obvious necessity in most cases to have the tunes made expressly for the words. This has been done so far as the first book goes, and duly recorded in the index. But when we come to the second, we are told that the musical arrangements and adaptations for it were not quite completed. From all this it is plain, that a chief part of the design has been, to produce striking effects from the orchestra. We need not say what strong

objections, in our judgment, lie against the introduction of such artistical refinements into religious services. There is no temptation in our country, certainly at present, to imitate so ambitious an example. But we take this opportunity to utter our protest against any innovations, that would tend to *unchurch* the sanctuary; that would turn the house of God either into an oratorical theatre or a concert-room.

N. L. F.

Art. IV.—DUTY OF AMERICAN WOMEN.*

The object of this appeal is to rouse American women on a subject of great importance, and particularly to draw their attention to an attempt which many ladies of different states and denominations are now making, "to promote popular education by the agency of American women." It is intended so to conduct this enterprise, that "every woman, of whatever character or standing, may feel an interest in it, and do something to sustain it," while "no one is made prominent." A Committee of gentlemen of six different religious denominations have consented to act for those who originated the plan, and among others, they recommend the immediate and universal circulation of this appeal, as one of the best preliminary measures.

The work itself, which we are thus called upon to bring under the notice of as many readers as possible, seems to us written with a high object, considerable ability, and admirable adaptation to its purpose. We think those who cry out, 'what! is there not enough done yet for popular education; is not this country remarkable for the opportunities of instruction laid before all classes?' will be silenced, when they read the startling facts presented in this little book. The statistical details form a solid foundation on which an appeal to the good sense of the reader rests firmly; and we think none who read the address candidly, can doubt that the danger is as great, the emergency as pressing, and the duty of prompt effort as imperative, as they are represented.

---

* *The Duty of American Women to their Country.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 1845. 18mo. pp. 164.

Neither do we think the plan proposed can seem chimerical to any fair-minded reader, unprejudiced against philanthropic schemes in general, and female projects in particular.

We have heard that a critic, in speaking of this book, remarked, "I wish women would let the French Revolution alone; they are not competent to meddle with such a mighty theme." The author of the appeal is probably quite aware, that a profound knowledge of history and of human nature is essential to any one who would go deeply into the "mighty theme;" that no single cause brought the curse of the Reign of Terror upon the fair land of France, and that it would be unwise and unfair to point out any solitary source of such a deluge of evil, as implying that none others existed. Miss Beecher, who is known as the author, does not do this, nor attempt to grasp the whole subject. We cannot see why one indubitable cause of that great historical event may not be treated of, and the event itself used as an illustration of consequences, by a female pen, if the connection be distinctly shown. It does not seem to us that she has gone either beyond her province or her ability. She has not undertaken to give us a history of the reign of terror, with all that introduced or terminated it, but in a concise and striking sketch shows that "a people without education have not intelligence enough to know what measures will secure safety and prosperity, nor virtue enough to pursue even what they know to be right; so that, when possessed of power, they will adopt ruinous measures, be excited by base passions, and be governed by wicked and cruel men." She employs the French Revolution simply as an illustration of this truth. Could she have found a fairer or a stronger one? Has she not a right to use the warning it conveys?

The next point is, that our republic, like the French, is actually in danger from a people without sufficient intelligence and virtue. She exposes the hollowness of our boastings on this very subject of general education. She is willing to do justice to the past, for she opens her statements thus: —

"What then, has saved our country from those wide sweeping horrors, that desolated France? Why is it that in the excitements of embargos, and banks, and slavery, and abolition, and foreign immigration, the besom of destruction has not swept

over the land? It is because there has been such a large body of educated citizens, who have had intelligence enough to understand how to administer the affairs of state, and a proper sense of the necessity of sustaining law and order; who have had moral principle enough to subdue their own passions, and to use their influence to control the excited minds of others." — p. 31.

None, we suppose, can doubt that when this state of things shall pass away, blessing and prosperity will pass with it. — Our attention is then called to alarming facts.

"What, then, are our prospects in this respect?" — "Look at the indications in our census. In a population of fourteen millions, we find one million adults who cannot read and write, and two millions of children without schools. In a few years, then, if these children come on the stage with their present neglect, we shall have three millions of adults managing our state and national affairs, who cannot even read the Constitution they swear to support, nor a word in the Bible, nor any newspaper or book. Look at the West, where our dangers from foreign immigration are greatest, and which by its unparalleled increase is soon to hold the sceptre of power. In Ohio, more than one third of the children attend no school. In Indiana and Illinois scarcely one half the children have any schools. Missouri and Iowa send a similar or worse report. In Virginia, *one quarter* of the white adults cannot even write their names to their applications for marriage licenses. In North Carolina, *more than half* the adults cannot read and write. The whole South, in addition to her hordes of ignorant slaves, returns more than half her white children without schools." — p. 33.

Well may she exclaim, with these facts,

"My countrywomen, what is before us? Intelligence and virtue our only safeguards, and yet all this mass of ignorance among us, and hundreds of thousands of ignorant foreigners being yearly added to augment our danger!" — p. 34.

Symptoms of the perils of which we are thus warned already manifest themselves in various parts of the country. That there is great corruption in political life, and that party spirit rages like a frenzy, all parties allow. But nations flourish outwardly long after these diseases have begun to consume their vitals. Are there no tokens of other penalties, of sudden and violent convulsions that may rend the body politic, break up and ruin public and private prosperity? Men engrossed with the cares of each day as it comes, immersed in business, or whirled along by political excitements, pause not to examine, and inquire what

these tokens mean. But the timid, nay, the thoughtful and observing, with a wise courage, look out anxiously on the scenes enacted in various parts of these United States; and as dismal tidings of riots, disturbances, and violent proceedings come wafted in upon "paper wings" from all quarters, they rise from the perusal with saddened hearts. They perceive that, if we have among us no titled nobility, education and wealth are fast constituting a privileged class, likely to be in a position every way as dangerous, objects of a jealousy which may be nourished into hatred and fury by demagogues, as soon as the majority of the ignorant and poor is large enough to supply engines of destruction. They need no prophet to come from the mountains and cry, "wo!" as did the ghastly prophet among the people of Granada. If benevolence will not do it, why will not interest rouse the educated to strain every nerve, that they may ever be an immense majority? Let them see to it, that the multitude have knowledge, religion and morals spread wide among them, and the poverty of that multitude will give them little trouble. Industry among the people follows intelligence and virtue as surely as day follows night, and leads worldly prosperity among them with a quiet, sure step. And yet how many who acknowledge this duty, think the acknowledgment enough; utter the truism, and then turn away as if saying, "I have no more to do with it."

To rouse the wealthy and educated classes from their "selfish apathy," Miss Beecher makes a bold appeal. She rises, too, nobly beyond sectarian principles, and we rejoice especially to hear from such a quarter such a suggestion as this:—"When the same influence and efforts are directed to educate our two millions of American children, as are now directed to establishing missions among the Heathen, our country may escape the yawning abyss now gaping to destroy."

The liberality which seems to characterize the author of this volume has a strong claim upon all enlightened minds, and we do pray that narrower and more timid counsels may never affect any who, in native strength or under holy influences, have risen above them. Let such not be ashamed of their own Christian charity and freedom from sectarian prejudice, nor anxious about its consequences. It

is too full of Christ's own spirit not to be followed by his blessing. If they are confident that the work in which they seek human cooperation is God's work, let them rejoice in all who are prompted to take an interest in it, and banish distrust, jealousy, and scorn of those who would be their fellow-laborers. We repeat our strong hope, that those who are disposed to act with liberality as regards sectarianism, in this enterprise, will not shrink in consequence of an outcry among those who have not yet reached so high a standard, fearing that the cause may lose popularity and suffer. They *know* that their own ground is the high, the true, the Christian ground; and there let them plant their cause, with a rational hope of success. Instead of falling back to the multitude, let them have the moral courage to summon the multitude up to them. They have the opportunity of doing a double work of usefulness, for they can hardly confer a greater blessing on the community than by making the members of various religious denominations know each other better and love each other more. We are convinced that much of the religious intolerance and uncharitableness which grieve pious hearts, does honestly proceed from misapprehension. Those that work together for holy objects will learn to understand each other, and as they draw nearer each other, will also approach their common Master.

And now we introduce the paragraphs which we consider among the most important in the book.

"Look then at the work to be done. Two millions of destitute children to be supplied with schools! To meet this demand, sixty thousand teachers, and fifty thousand school-houses are required. Or if we can afford to leave half of them to grow up in ignorance, and educate only the other half, thirty thousand teachers and twenty-five thousand school-houses must be provided, and that too *within twelve years*. The census calculates the children between four and sixteen, and in twelve years most of these children will be beyond the reach of school instruction, while other millions, treading on their heels, will demand still greater supplies."

"Where are we to raise such an army of teachers? Not from the sex which finds it so much more honorable, easy, and lucrative, to enter the many roads to wealth and honor open in this land. But few will turn from these to the humble, unhonored toils of the school-room and its penurious reward."

"It is *woman* who is to come in at this emergency, and meet this demand; woman, whom experience and testimony have shown to be the best, as well as the cheapest guardian and teacher of childhood, in the school as well as the nursery."

"Women, then, are to be educated for teachers, and sent to the destitute children of this nation by hundreds and thousands. This is the way in which *a profession* is to be created for woman, a profession as honorable and lucrative for her as the legal, medical, and theological for men. This is the way in which thousands of intelligent and respectable women who toil for a pittance barely sufficient to sustain life, are to be relieved and elevated." — pp. 62, 63.

Here is the double action of this most benevolent project. Who that has taken any interest beyond his own household, has not lamented that there were so few occupations above the menial, by which a female might support herself? Who cannot point out, perhaps among his own kindred, more than one "poor lady," — terms which convey the image of a position most awkward, painful, and hopeless! A blessing indeed will it be when a fitting channel is opened, in which may flow the tide of female activity, benevolence, and talent, now stagnating in many a town or village, and when the industrious minds and hands now reluctantly idle, may find a fresh field of useful occupation thrown open, and escape the horrors of dependence.

It has been shown that female teachers are wanted by thousands in this country. In this country also are vast numbers of women who not only might use, but do absolutely need this opportunity of employment. And the difficulty has been, how to fit the angles and corners of these two great wants together, so that both may be supplied. It is precisely this work which the plan now introduced is to accomplish, and we rejoice that an experiment has already been commenced in Cincinnati. There, as we understand, the work of preparing females to become teachers in places barren of all other sources of education, is actually begun; and when prepared, these courageous young women are to be placed wherever the superintendents of the work may consider them most likely to be useful. On these superintendents will devolve great labor and responsibility, and it is right that they should be selected from well-known individuals, in whom the public may reasonably be expected to place confidence.

The following is from the Circular which has lately appeared, in connexion with this work.

"It is proposed that about thirty women of the proper spirit and qualifications should assemble this autumn or winter in Cincinnati, to remain two months or more, as may be deemed expedient. Mrs. H. B. Stowe and Miss C. E. Beecher, under the direction of the Committee, (Rev. Dr. Elliott, Rev. Dr. Lynde, Rev. Bishop Smith, Rev. Jas. H. Perkins, Rev. Dr. McGuffey, Rev. Prof. C. E. Stowe,) will take the responsibility of preparing them for their peculiar duties; and then it is expected that the clergymen and home missionaries of various denominations will aid in securing their appropriate location, and cooperate in their labors."

Many will be the qualifications required for such teachers, and it may be easily seen that a peculiar preparation will be requisite for such a peculiar work. A self-devoting spirit there must be, the heart of a Xavier or a Fry; and not less, a competent judgment. It may be said that no teaching can bestow these. Those who have not the former, will soon retire; those who have not the latter, may learn how to supply the deficiency, partially, by patience, humility and caution. Into the particulars of this whole plan we will not enter, because to many they may seem chimerical, and they can be easily ascertained by those in whom any interest is awakened. Money — alas! if benevolent works could only be carried on without money! — money will be wanted, but we are agreeably surprised by the statement, that "it is calculated that, on an average, one hundred dollars will pay all the expenses of each teacher for travelling, board, preparation, and location."

Whatever may be thought of the details of the project, all must like the spirit of the address, because it is fair, and it is modest. It exaggerates nothing, and it displaces nothing. Its author is not one of those reformers who begin by tearing down. Nor would she have women undertake what can and will be accomplished as well without them, nor touch what men can do better than they can. She gives patriotism a place among feminine virtues, though women are apt to consider it a masculine one; yet she would not have them think it acts only in times of great trouble, and only manifests itself in a Judith, Boadicea, or Maid of Saragossa. She would have us know that it may

animate the bosom of a school-mistress in a country village, and evidently understands that it is not a thing separate from all other forms of virtue; but that she is in fact the best patriot, who most faithfully discharges every known duty, even the humblest. Love of country is appealed to only as an additional stimulus, a fresh motive for exertion. Will not the virtues of every woman who can be roused to such broad and generous views of life as to glow with the love of her country, be of a high and noble cast? We fear it would be difficult in this whole country, where politics are a chief topic of conversation, to find any large class of women who ever think of their having any duty whatever as citizens. And yet, if it be a fact that a woman owes something to her country no less than a man, she can no more escape from this duty than from any other. Those who have not thought upon the matter, and therefore do not know whether they have any duty of the kind or not, are clearly bound to do this much — examine the subject. The bare intimation, that something which God requires us to do may be lying unnoticed and neglected by our side, ought to startle every conscientious woman into immediate search for it. And it will.

We have expressed a fear that this volume will be received with apathy. Many will not read it, or what is as bad, will read it carelessly, misunderstanding some parts, and taking in its solemn and weighty import but partially. But let those who feel the force of its statements do something for the cause, in some of the various ways which Miss Beecher indicates so judiciously; at least express their sympathy warmly, and so thaw others. In this power of expression, few women are wholly deficient. If any think their capacity for action straitened by circumstances, they are under the more obligation to interest others, if possible, who can act. Their sphere of influence may be narrow, yet who knows that they may not casually present the subject to some human being, who will take a deep interest in it, be blessed with opportunities, and eventually become a blessing to the cause?

The Appendix to this work contains one note which we cannot fairly pass without comment. In "note A" the author, having "presented a mode of religious training adapted to schools composed of children whose parents are

of different sects," adds a modification, which, we think, destroys the claim of the work to an exemption of the best kind. It is not exempt from sectarianism, and we are disappointed. Doubly so; because although we believe Miss Beecher to be above the desire of inculcating sectarian views on the present occasion, others will come to a different conclusion; and because we are sure that the perusal of this note will hinder, more than it will help, a noble cause. It is true, she cautiously states that "this modification she wishes to present to that class of parents who not only believe in the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, but are in the habit of addressing their worship to Him distinctively." But are these parents the only individuals into whose hands the work will pass, into whose she wishes and earnestly seeks to have it pass? Does she not openly desire its circulation and perusal, and a cooperation with its designs, among all religious denominations? We do not deny her right to insert such a page for the use of the readers whom she designates, but considering the work as avowedly intended for the whole public, and bearing in mind its claim to something above the diffusion of doctrines, we doubt her wisdom. Had a benevolent individual of the Unitarian denomination devised this plan, written this book, and sent it abroad in a similar manner, containing a page or two of strong, distinct Unitarianism, would not its circulation among other sects have been injured by it? Would Miss Beecher and her friends have been ready to place it in the hands of all whom they could reach? Would they have pronounced it right in the Unitarian, thus to use the opportunity of bringing his peculiar views before those who shun them?

Still it must be remembered that the passage to which we object is not in the body of the work, and ought not to interfere with its usefulness. We have spoken of it, not so much from any sensitiveness of our own, as from a knowledge of the general state of feeling on these delicate points, among all denominations. God speed the time when a simple, fervent, all-prevailing desire to serve the Lord and do good, shall amalgamate Christians into one humble, peaceful company of heaven-bound pilgrims, cheering each other on, instead of pausing to question and differ.

L. J. H.

ART. V.—ON CHRISTIAN UNION.

IN proposing to offer some remarks on Christian union, our minds naturally recur to that remarkable prayer of our Lord, as the very text and guide of our meditations:—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for those also who shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may know that thou hast sent me."

The question naturally arises in the mind — a question which we would ask reverently — has this prayer been answered? If it has, Christian union must be something different from what it has been commonly thought to be. Christians have not been agreed upon points either of doctrine, of ritual, or of Church government. If agreement upon any of these subjects be the oneness which our Saviour prayed for, then his prayer has not been answered; there has been no such agreement. In the earliest age, Arians and Trinitarians, and other successive parties separated by nice metaphysical distinctions; then, the Roman and Greek Churches; afterwards, the Catholics and Protestants; and since, many Protestant sects, — Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and Pedo-baptists, Wesleyan, and Whitfieldian Methodists, Calvinists, Arminians, Pelagians; these have divided into almost endless partitions the visible domain of the Christian Church.

Let us then proceed to inquire into this great question, what *is* the Christian union? It is a question that has perplexed all times, and seems not yet to be settled, or at least not to have obtained any unanimity, among Christians. It might be argued by some, in a spirit unfriendly to Christianity, that since Christians have not agreed yet as to what their appropriate union is, there can have been no union whatever among them. But we think it will be found that there *is* a union, and always has been, of which they have less distinctly thought. Philosophers have not yet agreed what light and heat are, but still light and heat exist, notwithstanding all their disputes about them. What is the principle that draws and holds the planets in their orbits, men of science have not determined, and they have had

many theories about it; but the attraction has been none the less certain for that.

But to proceed; with regard to Christian union, three grounds have been taken. The first makes union to consist in having one visible Church and one visible head; the second, in a sufficient doctrinal agreement; the third, in the simple reception of Christ and of his spirit. Of these three kinds of union, the first is organic; the second speculative; the third moral or spiritual. Neither of the first two, it is true, proposes to exclude the last; but each one insists upon its own peculiar view as essential to Christian union; while the last rejects them both, — that is, as being necessary, — maintaining that the simple faith in Christ and likeness to him are enough to make a man a Christian and to place him in the Christian brotherhood. Of these three grounds the first is occupied by the Catholics, who demand a visible uniformity and a common subjection to the Roman Pontiff; the second, by the predominant Protestant sects, who require an agreement in what are called fundamental articles of faith; and the third, by a large and increasing body of Christians, who maintain that the only legitimate bonds of Christian union are those good and pure affections which gather around the Christ and the Christian teaching, and are witnessed by a Christian life.

We have said that this union has been placed by Christians upon three distinct, formal grounds, — organic, doctrinal, and spiritual; or Catholic, Protestant, and ultra-Protestant. We may farther observe, to pass from the form to the nature of it, that this union must be one of two kinds, speculative or moral. That is to say, it must be founded on opinions, or affections; on creed, or character. The one attaches to the first two grounds; the other to the third. To accept the constitution and government of the Catholic Church, or to accept the fundamental articles of the predominant Protestant sects, is an office of the understanding. To recognise the living Christ, as our Saviour, Guide, Example, is the part of the affections.

Is the union of Christians — that oneness for which Christ prayed — a speculative, or a moral union? Now we are prepared to answer; not the first certainly, for no such union ever has existed. If it be this, Christ's prayer has not been answered; for there is no agreement among

Christians about creed, church order, or ritual; and some have rejected them all. For instance, the Friends; and will any one deny that the Friends are Christians? And yet they have had neither creed nor priesthood nor sacrament. And that which has not been, in the nature of things cannot be. In matters of mere opinion, difference is inevitable, union is impossible. Men's minds never can agree. But with the heart it is not so. Its judgments are far clearer, and scarcely admit of any material difference. The beauty of the life of Christ, the love of God and of men, penitence, humility, patience, self-denial, justice, truth-telling, forgiveness of injuries — all these things are very plain. In regard to these there has been union among Christians. Is not this the union, then, for which Christ prayed?

Consider, further, how he describes the union he prayed for. "As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us." Can any one doubt that this is a union in love? It were irreverent to ask, if this is an agreement in speculative views. No; it is a union in love. We cannot, we dare not think it any other.

For ourselves we are prepared, and we feel obliged, to go the whole length of this conclusion. However a man may speculate about Christian doctrines, if, honoring, studying and imitating Jesus Christ, he is filled with his mind; if the gentleness, the patience and love of Christ shine in his life; if Christ is thus "formed in him, the hope of glory," we must say that he is a Christian in spirit. We will not go behind this imitation of Jesus, to ask whether his reasonings about Christ or Christianity be correct.

'Not,' it may be asked, 'if he seem to you to reject the peculiar faith, the entire speculative basis of Christianity?' No, not if he seems to us to reject all this. The head may err, may swerve from speculative Christianity, while the heart does not swerve from vital Christianity.

But here is a distinction which we must endeavor more fully to unfold. Is there any inconsistency, any self-contradiction, in our saying, that a man's speculative Christianity may be wrong, and his vital Christianity right? May not the heart be right, while the head is wrong? *We* are not of those who think that error is a small evil; but is it a fatal evil? Suppose that Trinitarianism or Unitarianism,

Calvinism or Arminianism, the supernatural or the mythic theory, be the only true speculative version of Christianity; does it follow that he who does not see this, is a bad man, and must "without doubt," as the Athanasian creed says, "perish everlastingly?"

We pray the reader to look into this question carefully and candidly. Here are found prevailing in the Christian world various explanations of Christianity. Suppose that you had never heard anything about these creeds and church constitutions, and they were now laid before you side by side for the first time. Could you, guided by reason alone, put your finger upon any one of them and say, 'this alone is connected with goodness of heart, with the Christian affections, with the love and imitation of Christ?' Can you see any such exclusive connexion? If you can, you must point it out; you must show the necessary logical bond between the one and the other. But this we are persuaded you can never do. Goodness has its root in the heart, not in a creed. Holiness springs and lives in a heart breathed on by the spirit of God. You will remind us, perhaps, that our Saviour says, "sanctify them by thy truth;" but what truth is that? "Thy word is truth." Not, as such, the truth of any human creed; but the moral, spiritual, everlasting truth of the Bible. But again, what is the fact? Are there not good Christian men in all churches, under all creeds? Where is the Christian Communion, that will dare to assert that it embraces all the good men in the world? Even the Catholic Church does not assert that; teaching as it does, that only *wilful* error in those who depart from it, is fatal. And concerning the *Pagan* Cornelius, Peter said, "of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." Shall the measure of charity extended to Heathen nations, be denied to Christian sects? But once more; what is to become of the mass of mankind, of multitudes crushed by toil, buried in ignorance, not able even to read, if it is necessary for them to fix upon the right explanation? Nay, what are we to think of the peril that hangs over intelligent and studious men? For ourselves we do advisedly say, if a book like the New Testament were put into our hands, and we were told

that there was only one right construction of it, and that we must fix upon that construction in order to be saved, we would never open that book! We would *never* take that tremendous risk. We would fly to the tender mercies of Heathenism for safety; to the broad charter of Peter's creed in the case of Cornelius.

We must maintain, then, that Christian virtue, Christian union, is compatible with every variety of honest construction of the New Testament.

But now, from this liberality must there flow any bad consequence or any irrational conclusion? Does it follow, that we must resign our own opinion about Christianity, or undervalue it? Or that we must not argue or contend against opposing opinions? Or does it follow, that what we are now saying is inconsistent with what we have lately maintained, when we expressed our conviction that the rationalistic or mythic construction of Christianity, in our view, amounted to an entire speculative rejection of it? We think not. With our views we may and we must regard the, so called, *orthodox* version of Christianity as a speculative subversion of it. Its leading doctrines, the Trinity, native and total depravity, and *vicarious* atonement, we are obliged to consider not as Christian doctrines, but as anti-Christian. Thus we have lately said, — and it has been the subject of severe public comment, — that we could better defend Deism than Calvinism. But the comment would have been spared, we think, if we had been understood. For, does it follow from all this, that we must pronounce Trinitarians or Calvinists, bad men, men devoid of the Christian spirit? Not at all. We may respect and love their Christian virtues, though we cannot think their creed to be the Christian creed. They are equally obliged by their position to regard our creed as wrong, and perhaps as utterly defective; but they are not therefore obliged to say, that we are utterly wanting in the Christian character. Thus, again, we regard, and we cannot help regarding rationalism, the denial of miracles and of everything supernatural in Christianity, as an entire speculative rejection of it. But we do not say that those who take this ground, are devoid of all Christian virtue. We can admit that they may be more faithful imitators of Christ than we are; and we can value, esteem and love them

accordingly. Let us see men who fervently love one another, and tenderly pity and help their kind; let us see men filled with the love of Christ and breathing his spirit; and though they may have erred much concerning the Christ, we have such a view of his love and disinterestedness, that we believe he would love and bless them, though he reproved them. And we do not believe that we have risen to the heights of Christianity, till we see, that pure, simple, all-asborbing love is that to which God and angels and the universe give greeting and welcome. Alas! we are weak and erring and blind; but the heart may be true and right, amidst all our errors. And a painful thing it is, to see a man violently contending for a doctrine, be it this or that, while he is losing the end and spirit of all good and pure doctrine. Be our soul gathered — we are willing to take the risk — be our soul gathered with the good, the charitable and loving, rather than with the cold, confident and condemning!

But let us distinctly repeat and say, that while we hold to this grand point of union, we do not give up any of the rights or responsibilities of opinion. If we think that any man has swerved from the cardinal truths of Christianity, by believing either too much or too little, as honest men we must say so; as honest men we must treat him accordingly. We may not wish to exchange pulpits with him. We may stand upon such different ground that we cannot properly stand together. We may exceedingly reprobate what we conceive to be his errors, as he may what he conceives to be ours. But still let us love one another: that cannot harm us. And if we truly love one another, in a common reverence and love for the blessed Master, we believe we are united in the Christian bond. We believe there is that oneness between us for which Christ prayed.

Perhaps we should more fully express our thought, if we said that we should look upon such cases as exceptions. If a community were gathered which was imbued with the skepticism of Strauss, we should not look there for a prevalence of Christian order, purity and virtue. And we do not see how they would be possible, if that skepticism went to the length of rejecting the moral and pure ideal of the Christ; a length of which Strauss scarcely

falls short. We could not regard such as a community of Christian men. Still if, with whatever inconsistency, that order, purity and virtue were found in any soul, we should say that that soul had not broken from the bond of Christian union.

Let us take this matter for a moment out of the province of religion. In science, in philosophy, even in moral philosophy, do we ever think of judging men's character by their theories? But let us take an example. A dying parent says to his children, 'I hope and pray that you may always be united; by all the sacredness of my memory, I charge you to love one another.' In after-life, they dwell in the same neighborhood; they are often in each other's company; they converse much together. They differ necessarily about many things; about their farming, the politics of the country, the bringing up of their children; about the Temperance question perhaps, the Anti-slavery question, and many others. They do not regard these differences as unimportant; they even go so far, it may be, as to think that the prudence of life, the prosperity of business, the welfare of the country, is involved in them; but they all revere their father's memory, and they are all united in love. Is not their father's hope, and prayer, fulfilled? Is not this a good and happy union? Is it not the only union possible? Suppose, moreover, that their father had left them a will; and that they differed about the construction of the instrument. As human passions ordinarily display themselves, this difference would breed a violent quarrel. But suppose that the last clause in that will had been an earnest prayer, that they might be united in brotherly love; and that bowing before that last, solemn and touching petition, they had said, 'We will love one another, however we differ.' Would not that have been the fulfilment of the prayer? Would it not, we repeat, have been the only fulfilment possible?

But now to continue the comparison, and to introduce the only objection to our view of union that occurs to us, —'there are cases,' it may be said, 'where a certain construction of the will in question would evidently proceed from a bad, selfish, avaricious heart.' It is true. And now we ask, can this be applied to the construction of Christianity? Bad passions may have influence in individ-

ual instances; — the love of power or emolument, in this; the love of notoriety or indulgence, in that. But can this be true of whole bodies of Christians? Look around you, and tell us if you do not see good, pure, true men in every church, under every creed. If you say you do not, then stand forth as a mark for universal wonder at such uncharitableness. If you say that you do, then you cannot attribute their choice of church or creed to a bad heart. Choice, did we say? How few ever choose at all! How certainly are most men found in the churches in which they are born! Parental discipline, social influence, a thousand involuntary and invincible biasses, have placed them where they are. And will you say that their position is owing to a bad heart, to want of reverence and love for Christ and Christianity? If you do not say this, then our argument has free course. Then you must admit, that in every church there may be good and devout Christians. Then diversities of faith do not break the Christian bond.

'Yes, but' — a man may say — 'my construction *involves the vitality* of it.' *Whose* construction? If it be that of any one church, of any one sect, of any one system of theology, if it be the Catholic's, the Churchman's, or the Calvinist's construction, then it is no longer the ground of union which is taken, but of *schism*. The union which any one church or theology obtains by the excommunication of all others, is *not* union, but separation. There *can* be no union on such a principle. We grant that the position here taken by the objector, is impregnable. We have no more to say to him, who gives it to us as his final decision, that upon no other system than his is Christian virtue possible; that no man can love and imitate Jesus Christ, unless he receive the Institutes of Calvin, the Apostolic succession, or the infallibility of Rome. But then what is this impregnable position? It is a guarded and frowning fortress, and not the broad field of Christendom! It is a castle, and not a kingdom!

We seek for a principle broad enough to bind the Christian churches and nations together. And we can find it nowhere but in the recognition and imitation of Jesus Christ as Master; in "confessing him to be Lord, to the glory of God the Father." And we are forced, of necessity, to the conclusion that diversities of faith do not break this Christian bond.

Is it not a delightful conclusion? Is it not an inexpressible relief, to be able to say, 'I need not judge men by their speculative faith, but only by the lowly and loving virtues of the heart:' to say, with the late excellent and devoted Dr. Arnold of the English Church, "to me it is the very truth of truths, that Christian unity and the perfection of Christ's Church are independent of theological articles of opinion; consisting in a certain moral state and moral and religious affections, which have existed in good Christians of all ages and all Communions, along with an infinitely varying proportion of truth and error."

Let us consider, briefly, some of the happy consequences that would flow from this idea of Christian unity.

We have said that it does not abridge our freedom of opinion, our freedom to judge of the true and the false in the religious systems around us. This liberty we must have. We cannot surrender it, if we would. If we *think* of the various forms of theology, we must judge of them. We must freely form and frankly express this judgment. We desire the freedom of strong preference and of strong dissent. We are not content to think our creed, our church order, about as good as another's. We must have leave to think it a great deal better. We must confess, we like a good, strong, manly, but good-natured, large-hearted sectarism. We have no favor for the lax and easy indifference which holds one form of faith or worship to be as good as another. Our opinion about religious truth is the strongest, the most vital opinion we have. But now, is this freedom of opinion forbidden or diminished by the charity which we advocate? On the contrary, it is enlarged, protected, secured by it. It would be a terrible thing to judge of another's creed, if our thinking must decide upon his being, upon his character and final fate. Controversy, which is an excellent thing in its place, a necessary conflict of imperfect ideas designed for their general progress, must lose half its uses in this awful dogma. When, in good faith, we can say to our brother opponent, 'You are a good man, we believe, and a devoted Christian, — we deny not your good intent;' then we can freely add, 'But we hold that you are wrong, not denying at the same time, that *we* may be, — yet our simple opinion is, that you are in an error, and a great error.' This open, frank, modest and manly

bearing would put a new face upon religious differences. Controversy would then be a serious indeed, but a noble and generous thing. And how upon any other principle can we examine our own faith with any freedom? If to swerve from our own present view of religious truth is perdition, to examine it is rashness and folly. Indeed it is preposterous to reason with a man who is under the influence of that tremendous fear; for he is not free to reason; he cannot fairly yield to argument; he refuses the very terms on which alone any fair debate is possible. And we are inclined to say, that it were well if controversy had been stopped at this very point, on the very threshold; if the liberal disputant had said, 'It is useless to proceed till you are prepared to go upon fair and equal ground.' And certainly it is easy enough to see, while this ground is denied, why the religious thought, the religious philosophy of the age is behind all other thought, all other philosophy.

The first advantage, then, of our principle of Christian union is, that it would give a new, healthful, just and reasonable character to religious controversy.

In the next place, not only does all fair controversy, but all reasonable candor seem to have its only chance in this principle. How is it possible to regard with candor an opinion, which is necessarily connected with a bad heart and a state of perdition? A tolerant spirit towards damning error, is treason to truth and humanity. The Inquisition itself was hardly wrong upon its premises. A man known to be entertaining and spreading soul-destroying error *should* be put in prison, if not scourged and killed. We do that to those who only wound and destroy the body. Why not to those who wound and destroy the soul? We all disavow this awful intolerance. But, to be consistent, we must disown the principle from which it springs.

And in taking this ground, we speak not only for the general and aggregate welfare of Christendom, but we speak for the interest of our own mind and of every man's mind. We cannot bear that our Christian sympathies should be pent up within any sectarian peculiarity. We wish to revere and love the virtues of all men, of men differing most widely from us. Fenelon, and Melancthon, and Wesley, and Baxter, and Berkley, and Leighton, and Mayhew, and Channing — who would not revere such men? The

virtue of the world is the light of the world; and we would not lose one ray of it. It is a grief and a shame, to live amidst benignant and lovely examples of goodness and to be blind to them, or to see them only through the distorting scowl of bigotry and hatred. And there is danger of this to all minds. It requires a resolute effort to break through these sectarian barriers that parcel out the Christian world; and we see not how it is to be done at all, except by breaking down this false principle, that a man's creed is the test of his virtue.

We say that we speak for the interest of our own mind, and of every man's mind. Intolerance is a narrowness and meanness and injustice. It is a paltry and miserable prejudice in every other relation of life. Why should it not be in the Christian relation? The ignorant boor, who looks upon a Turk or a Chinese as a strange curiosity rather than as a fellow-man; the class-man, who can see no beauty of life out of his walk of fashion or wealth; the man of family pride, who can see nothing fit to associate with out of his family circle, is simply a pitiable being, who does not comprehend the great and goodly world he lives in. How much more pitiable to live in the great spiritual world, and to shut up one's sympathy and admiration within a single narrow inclosure! It is self-imprisonment. It is to choose the faint twilight of a dungeon rather than the broad light of day.

In the third place, any other principle of union than the one we defend, must create a painful state of relations among Christians. If it is necessary, it must be endured — as a great affliction; for such it certainly is. There is, we say, a deep pain in the heart of the Christian brotherhood, rent and torn as it is by this principle of exclusion. It must be so, or Christians are not men. The disputes of philosophers and men of science are bitter and painful enough, as they are: but what would they be, if they were thought to involve character and eternal hope? How awful and distressing would be our political strifes upon this condition! We sleep over this dreadful state of our Christian communities, we are insensible to it, because it is familiar to us, or because we see it only in the general and as something inevitable. But carry down this matter into the bosom of life. See a Christian family dwelling by

another kind, Christian family of a different faith, and obliged to regard its members as devoid of all saving goodness and on the way to perdition. What a grief must it be! What affliction in life can be like it? And in all their neighborly intercourse, what painful collisions or reserves or cautions must there be! And all these take their edge from the fatal principle, that certain differences of opinion involve all spiritual purity. Perhaps these kind neighbors and friends live on, and never speak to one another of what is nearest their hearts. If they would open their hearts, they would find them marvellously alike; but now those fountains of love are sealed up by suspicion. And the very brotherhood, which Jesus made to be the bond of love, is a galling chain. For we verily believe, that many persons would live more comfortably with Mahometans, than they do with their own Christian brethren.

In fine, what harm would there be in treating all men who possess the Christian virtues, with candor, kindness and respect? The principle would not be a compromise with error. It leaves us at full liberty to think our neighbor wrong in his interpretation of truth, to protest against his error, to say even, if we think so, that his views are injurious to piety or dangerous to morality. But why must we go farther, and say that he cannot possess any pure Christian virtue with that faith? Why must we put that fatal element into the case? Will it be said, that truth is endangered by a principle so liberal as that which we adopt? But do not the truths of reason, of science, stand firmly enough without any such terrible safeguard? And cannot God's truth in the Bible stand without it? Truth, did we say? How is the pursuit of truth aided by this awful fear of perdition? Manifestly it is, and must be, hindered. Where had philosophy and science been, if this tremendous peril had weighed upon every step of progress? They would still have been entangled by the syllogisms of Aristotle and the mysteries of astrology and alchemy. For this reason it is, in our opinion, that the dogmas of Augustine and Calvin still overshadow and perplex the paths of religious inquiry. It was indeed the most stupendous, the most awful of all the tyrannies ever set up over human thought, to establish a system of doctrine, and then to say

that any material departure from it involved the perdition of the soul. Yet we say not, that Calvin or Augustine meant wrong in this; nor that their error severed them from the body of Christ, though it was a gigantic and overwhelming error.

What harm would follow from the kind and liberal principle, did we say? Nay, what good would it not do! Then would Christian controversy have some chance of being calm and patient and enlightening. Then would a blessed candor and charity breathe through the Church. Then would the bitter pain of our divisions be done away. Then would the prayer of Christ be fulfilled, that his followers might "all be one."

And let us add, that it has been fulfilled to an extent that is a wonder and glory amidst the ages. We do not consider perhaps, how great was that petition. It was a sublime prayer, in a world which every mountain and river had separated into hostile tribes and nations, that one great brotherhood might arise which should bind nations and tribes and families into unity. None but the Son of God, none but he who felt in himself the power of an unbounded love, ever conceived such a design, ever uttered such a prayer. And the love that bore that prayer to Heaven, has penetrated the heart of the world. Do we not feel something of its gracious presence around us and among us? Does it not appear in speech and form and faith? One name, one covenant, one altar, one worship — are not these strong bonds? The name of Christian, Christian brother — does it not thrill in hearts unnumbered throughout Christendom? The name of Christ — does it not rise in the prayers of innumerable households, far round the world? As amidst all our political divisions still we love our country, and nothing can break the magic spell of native sky and home; so amidst all our religious divisions, still our hearts turn with filial veneration to Bethlehem and Gethsemane, to the holy hill of Olives and the sacred mount of Calvary. And Jerusalem, waste and desolate though she be — who of us would not rather set foot within her mournful gates, than on any other spot of earth? Is there not a bond then; a bond of union to Christ? Let it be acknowledged, and not denied. Let it be cherished, and not rent asunder. Let us think more of our agree-

ment than of our differences. Let us think of Christ more than of Paul or Apollos, more than of Calvin or Arminius or Socinus, more than of our creed or church or sect.

Union! Is not the Church sighing for it? Is not the world weary of its conflicts? Is not a cry coming, amidst all our sad divisions, from the East and the West, from the North and from the South, for Christian union? Are not many minds tending to this point? Is not that great, last prayer of Christ for his disciples more manifestly to be accomplished: — "that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they all may be one in us?"

O. D.

Art. VI. — STUART ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

This work of Professor Stuart is chiefly directed against Mr. Norton's Note on the Old Testament, which is appended to the second volume of his very able and learned work on the Genuineness of the Gospels. For a book having this object in view, it appears to us a very singular production. The greater part of it, that is, about three hundred out of the four hundred and fifty of its pages, is taken up, or at least professes to be taken up, in the proof of what Mr. Norton has never denied, and of which, as we suppose, he entertains no doubt; viz: that in the time of our Saviour, and for a considerable time previous, all the books now regarded by Protestants as forming the Old Testament were recognised by the Jews as sacred books. There may be a difference of opinion as to the exact time when the Jewish canon closed, whether it was about two hundred, or four hundred years before the Christian era. But there is no doubt, of which we are aware, among those whose opinion Mr. Stuart opposes, that the same books, which Protestants now regard as exclusively belonging to the Jewish canon, were so regarded by the Jews between one and two hundred years before the Christian era. How happens it then, that, of a work professing to answer Mr. Norton's

* *Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon.* By M. Stuart, Professor of Sac. Literature in the Theol. Seminary, Andover, Mass. Andover. 1845. 12mo. pp. 452.

views, the writer has devoted the greater part to the proving of what Mr. Norton and the critics who agree with him have neither denied, nor doubted? How is it, that he has avoided nearly all the difficult questions belonging to the subject, by referring them to what he calls "the department of Theology, specially of apologetic and polemic theology?" Surely this is neither reasonable, nor kind to those whom Mr. Stuart supposes to be in error. To us it seems to betray a considerable lack of courage in a Professor of Sacred Literature, to choose the easy task of proving what is not only admitted, but proved by De Wette and others, who agree with Mr. Norton on the character and authorship of the Pentateuch, and to leave the task of refuting the arguments, on which his opponents chiefly rely, to the Professors of Dogmatics. With quite as much reason, we think, may the Professors of Dogmatics refer it back to a Professor of Biblical Literature. Of the one hundred and fifty pages of Mr. Norton's Note on the Old Testament, Mr. Stuart has attempted an answer on critical principles to not more than four or five, namely, those which relate to the use of alphabetic writing and the diction of the Pentateuch; the argument from which, as stated by Mr. Norton, is by no means material to the decision of the main question.

It is true that Mr. Stuart may say, that if his principal argument is valid, there is no need of attempting to remove difficulties relating to the Old Testament on principles of historical and critical investigation. This argument is, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles have recognised not only the authority, but the inspiration of every part of the Old Testament, and therefore we must receive it, or reject Christianity. The story of the exploits of Samson, and the fortunes of Jonah, with that of the express command of God to exterminate the Canaanites, rests on the same authority, as the sermon on the Mount. Was it wise, in one who wishes to convince those who differ from him, thus to take the subject out of the province of critical and historical investigation? Suppose that Mr. Stuart has succeeded in proving to the satisfaction of those, who doubt the divine inspiration and the prophetic authorship of some parts of the Old Testament, that in order to be consistent they must reject Christianity, as a divine revelation? What good has he effected? He has not removed a single

difficulty from any mind. All the difficulties of the Old Testament, which have perplexed the minds of thinking Christians from the time of Origen to the present day, still remain in all their force. Those upon whose minds they have been forced by the progress of inquiry are turned over by Mr. Stuart to the Professors of Dogmatics, perhaps to be sent back by them to the Biblical critics. The evident tendency, then, of Mr. Stuart's argument is, to induce those who have doubts relating to the inspiration and authorship of some parts of the Old Testament to reject the authority of Jesus Christ. The language of many such persons would naturally be of the following import: — 'We have had faith, resting on historical and moral evidence, in the divine authority of Jesus Christ. But we have faith also in other things. We believe in certain truths relating to astronomical and geological science, which appear to us to rest on as good evidence as that for the divine authority of Jesus Christ. We believe also in certain truths relating to the moral character of the Deity, and his dealings with the children of men. Now, having found in the Old Testament some statements which appear to us to conflict with the truths of natural and moral science, and even with the teachings and precepts of Christ, we have publicly stated our difficulties, and suggested a mode in which they may be reconciled with the truth of the Christian revelation. Our hypothesis is, that some parts of the Old Testament are not the production of infallible inspiration, and some books of it not the genuine production of inspired prophets, though in general we acknowledge those books to be the records of a revelation from God to the Jews. But what you have to say to us is, that we must take the whole of the Old Testament or none; nay, that we must receive the whole of it as inspired by God, or reject Christianity. If you are right, then, we must reject Christianity. For we cannot help believing the established truths of natural and moral science.'

Such, we think, must be the train of thought in the minds of some of those who may be convinced that Mr. Stuart has established his main point. The effect of his argument on others of more timid character will be, to stop inquiry; to make them give up attention to the critical study of the Old Testament, lest the result should be unfavorable to their Christian faith.

We regret, therefore, that Mr. Stuart has pursued such a course of argument, though we do not regard it as valid. The subject of the character and claims of the Old Testament is one, on which all serious minds are open to conviction. It is not a question of sect or party. Unitarians are not more concerned in it as such, than Trinitarians. All that the friends of divine revelation seek on this subject is the truth, let who will maintain it. When such men as Mr. Norton, in a course of serious and scientific inquiry, questions the genuineness of the Pentateuch, or such men as Doederlein and Tholuck, not to mention the anti-supernaturalists, deny the genuineness of the last twenty-six chapters of Isaiah, or such men as Dr. Arnold avow their belief in the spuriousness of the book of Daniel, — all professing to be guided by the principles of critical and historical investigation, and all firm and devoted friends to the Christian revelation, — it is not enough to say to them, 'If you continue to hold your opinions, you must renounce your Christian faith. You are inconsistent men. You must, to be consistent, go farther, and deny Christ; and we really wish you would, and then we should know where to find you.'* No! those who think such opinions erroneous, ought to endeavor to refute them by other means than those which Mr. Stuart has used. It affords no pleasure to such men as we have named, to call in question received views. It would be far more pleasant, if regard to truth would allow it, to sail smoothly in the wake of popular opinion. Their views are entitled to respect. If they are unsound, undoubtedly they can be shown to be so, on the principles of critical and historical investigation. A refutation of those views on such principles can alone give satisfaction to an earnest and thorough inquirer. To undertake it on any other principles betrays a secret, though it may be an unconscious, skepticism in regard to the possibility of refuting them.

But we are far from thinking, that Mr. Stuart has established his point. We may doubt the genuineness of some books, and the inspiration of some parts, of the Old Testament, and yet hold fast our faith in the Christian revelation.

---

* Mr. Stuart has not used this language, but on page 421 occur expressions which sound very much like it.

In the first place, on the supposition, that Mr. Stuart has established his premises, to wit, that Christ and his Apostles recognised the prophetic authorship and divine inspiration of all the books of the Old Testament, still his conclusion in reference to those whose opinions he opposes, is much too broad. For it is certainly conceivable, (we make the supposition to show how inconsequent is the Professor's reasoning,) that Jesus and the Apostles might be mistaken in some opinions, which they held in common with the Jews, and yet have been inspired in regard to the essential truths of the Christian revelation. The strongest inference that could be drawn from a mistake of Christ and the Apostles in regard to a question of criticism or history, would be their fallibility on certain subjects, and not their want of authority to make a revelation of divine truth. Many Orthodox divines have supposed that the Apostle Paul expected a personal and visible coming of Christ during his life-time, but this has not impaired their confidence in his being inspired with the great Christian ideas. Dr. Priestley and others have held Christ to be fallible on some subjects, while they have had undoubted confidence in his authority to reveal the essential doctrines of Christianity. Should any one, therefore, take the ground, — which we would not be understood as taking, — that Christ and the Apostles were fallible in regard to certain opinions connected with their Jewish education, he would not be compelled to renounce his faith in the Christian revelation.

But we can by no means admit, that Mr. Stuart has shown it to be a fact, that Christ and his Apostles regarded all the books of the Old Testament as the genuine productions of inspired prophets, or all parts of them as given by infallible inspiration. The passages quoted by Mr. Stuart are far from proving the point. Some of them are wholly irrelevant, and the expressions used in others are too general and indefinite to answer the purpose for which they are adduced. From the references made by our Saviour to the Old Testament we may conclude, that in his view it contained much that is divine and can never pass away. But that he intended to sanction all that is contained in it, or to settle critical questions in regard to the genuineness and authority of every book in it, appears to us in the highest degree improbable, and not only not supported, but even

contradicted by his language. In the sermon on the Mount he spoke of some of the laws of the Old Testament in a very different manner from that in which he would have spoken of the laws of God. And how could he, who gave the command, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you," have supposed that the extermination of the Canaanites by the Jews was by express Divine command? Or, how could he, who died praying for his enemies, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" have sanctioned the imprecations in the cixth Psalm, or other passages of the Old Testament having a similar character?

The learned and impartial Neander, whose praise is equally high with Christians of all denominations, has remarked in reference to the diseases of the demoniacs of the New Testament: —"In regard to the question whether Christ expressed any decided opinion respecting the origin of these diseases, it must be remembered that an investigation into their immediate cause appertained to scientific psychology, a subject which was left to the gradual development of natural science. Accordingly, from the circumstance of his leaving uncontroverted the popular theory, it cannot be inferred that he either sanctioned or approved it; the subject being one which from its nature did not come within the range of his instructions."* May it not be doubted with equal propriety, whether it came "within the range of his instructions" to decide all the questions, which might arise in the progress of scientific inquiry, relating to the character and criticism of the books of the Old Testament? We can see no stronger reason why, in his short mission upon the earth, our Saviour should have entered into controversy with the Jews on the subject of the character and claims of their sacred books, than on the subjects of psychology, astronomy, or geology. Criticism and interpretation, like psychology and astronomy, might well be left by him "to the gradual development of natural science."

Let it be supposed,—what cannot be proved,—that Christ and the Apostles regarded all the books composing the Jewish canon as having been written by prophets, in the

* See Extracts from Neander's 'Leben Jesu', translated by Rev. J. R. Beard, p. 44.

sense in which the Hebrews understood the term. Still, before the conclusion could be established at which Professor Stuart has arrived, how much must be proved respecting the nature and the extent of the inspiration of the Prophets! Was it occasional, or universal? Did it relate to all subjects, or only to that of religious truth? Was it, or was it not, consistent with fallibility? Did it consist in the suggestion of objective truth, or in the general exaltation and strengthening of the prophet's faculties? Many questions of this kind must be settled, and settled in a particular way, before Mr. Stuart's conclusions from the language of Christ and his Apostles can be regarded as established. In regard to many passages, too, the question would arise, how far Christ and the Apostles may have reasoned *ex concessis*, or from opinions held by the Jews without intending to sanction those opinions.

But we have neither space nor time for the discussion of the subject. We should be glad to close without saying anything of the spirit and tone of the book. We are aware that great latitude should be allowed for the expression of earnest feeling in a writer who is interested in his subject. But we might cite instances of superciliousness and discourtesy from Mr. Stuart's book, wholly unbecoming a Christian scholar and gentleman.* We might specify frequent instances of the *argumentum ad invidiam*, and of an offensive misstatement of the question under discussion. We might quote several passages, which are adapted to give false impressions of the opinions, not only of Mr. Norton,† but of Gesenius and Eichhorn, to persons unacquainted with those writers. What does Mr. Stuart mean, when he says that Gesenius was "*most of his life* a strenuous asserter of the late origin of the Pentateuch?" If he means that he ever altered his opinion on the subject, we believe the assertion to be destitute of foundation. Again, what does he mean, when he says of Eichhorn, that "he is left in the race of neological criticism immeasurably behind De Wette, Ewald, Lengerke, Mr. Norton and their compeers." Even in relation to the Old Testament this sweeping assertion

* See pp. 20, 21, 329, 344.

† See p. 20 at the top, and p. 22 at the middle.

would be unjust to Mr. Norton. But we presume not one reader in a hundred would limit the assertion to the Old Testament. Now Eichhorn disbelieved every supernatural occurrence, recorded either in the Old Testament or the New. He had no faith in any miracle, or proper prediction. Though he maintains the Mosaic authorship of a considerable portion of the Pentateuch, he expressly excepts that part of Exodus, comprising nearly half of it, which treats of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and the miraculous events which preceded it. He denied the genuineness of the three first Gospels, and of several other books both of the Old Testament and the New.* And yet, says Mr. Stuart, he is left far behind in the race of neology by Mr. Norton. And it is of such a man as Eichhorn that Mr. Stuart says, "nobly has he managed the cause of what I believe to be sound criticism, and justly has he decided it." All this praise is given him for maintaining, in his declamatory way, the genuineness of those parts of the Pentateuch, which he supposed to imply nothing supernatural. We have read of those who could "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel;" but we have never known the proverb more truly exemplified than in the case of a learned Professor, who could in the same breath laud Eichhorn, and condemn the author of the "Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels."

It gives us no pleasure to make the general remark, that this book of Mr. Stuart, though coming from one who deserves high praise for the impulse which he has given to the cause of sacred literature in our country, is anything rather than a scientific, scholarlike production. It abounds in loose and inconclusive reasoning. It may please a certain class of readers, who are never troubled with doubts or difficulties of any kind, or who delight to see odium cast upon those who differ in opinion from themselves. It may restrain the researches of the timid, and bind them to what has been thought or believed. But it will not convince an earnest and thorough inquirer.

We might remark upon some statements and opinions of Mr. Stuart, different from those commonly received by the

* See Eichhorn's Einleitung in das Alte Testament III. p. 240 etc. and p. 432. See also Einleitung in das Neue Testament I. pp. 445, and 691, and III. pp. 12, 13.

Orthodox, and which appear to us not very consistent with the main point which he labors to establish. But we have already extended this notice beyond our original intention. We will only add, that the section on the use of the Old Testament under the Gospel dispensation, being considerably in advance of the popular view, is adapted to do much good. We think it the most useful part of the book.

G. R. N.

Art. VII. — CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT CHRIST.

The kingdom which Jesus Christ has already won in this world is wider than its enemies, or even its friends suppose. Had he the full and undiminished honor of all the influence in behalf of truth and righteousness which has really originated in him, he would be more worthily confessed among men. If his name had attached to it all the epithets which we do not hesitate to attach to the effects and institutions that are to be traced to it, it would win the homage and reverence of many more hearts.

One of the most remarkable phenomena now presented throughout Christendom, is a professed reception of the truths, and an enjoyment of the fruits of Christianity, combined with a virtual rejection of the Author of Christianity. In some quarters Jesus Christ has been well nigh joined to the fellowship of certain unknown inventors and discoverers, certain nameless and unrecorded persons, to whom the world is indebted for many most valuable truths and processes. There have been many admirable discoveries and inventions in philosophy and science, the authors of which must forever lose their due honors, because we are ignorant of their names. In some cases, too, these honors are contested between rival claimants. The name of Christ has not perished; it is indissolubly associated with his Gospel. His life, indeed, is a large part of that Gospel. Still the strange phenomena present themselves, of the acceptance and enjoyment of Christianity as something that may be distinguished from its "Author and Finisher." In the professed faith, in the philosophical speculations, and in the

philanthropic practice of many among us, we shall find that there is now, as there has long been, a great deal of religious belief and religious effort bearing some other name than that of Christ, yet inspired by him, the honor of which is due to him, and which would gain in power if it were still associated with him.

It is an ancient, a cherished, and by no means an idle or unprofitable conviction of the wisest and best of our race, that the Divine Father of men raised up Jesus of Nazareth as his Messiah, and our Redeemer; that this messenger of God lived for a season upon the earth, and introduced into it a religion worthy of all acceptation; that he taught a pure faith, and enjoined a perfect rule of duty for man in all things. The sufficient testimony of experience has confirmed by long trial and by wide application this conviction of the wise and good. And if it was ever important that the name and authority of Christ should be associated with his lessons of truth and duty, it is important now. We should regard with a holy jealousy the honor due to Christ, and should never allow him to be severed in our faith or in our practice from the blessings which the world has received through him alone. All the attempts of sectarianism, of philosophy and free speculation, and of popular contrivances, to assume the work and honors of Christianity while the name of Christ is set aside, should be reminded of their obligation to him, of their dependence upon him, and of the importance of relying upon his sanction and help for success in all that is right. Let his name be blessed and dear to us. Let his authority be sufficient for us. If we cannot add to the truth and holiness of which he was the teacher and the example, let us not take from him the reverence which as our Master and Lord he claims. Let not the world nor any of its instructors, as age by age it testifies to the importance and the value of Christian faith, lose the memory of its origin, or sever its blessings from their Author.

The title which we have placed over these remarks — Christianity without Christ — is not so much chosen by us, as forced upon our use, in view of certain matters to which we shall now proceed to apply it. Let us premise however a statement which is very appropriate to this discussion. Jesus Christ seems to have anticipated this rejection or for-

getfulness of his name and his divine authority, and to have predicted the preference among men of other teachers to himself, even when they taught only the same as he taught, or less or more than his own doctrine. His most intimate disciple writes of him that he spoke these words — "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Veritable history shows that this plain assertion was true even at the moment when it was uttered, for Judea was overrun at that time by impostors who could each of them boast a larger retinue than could the Messiah. A long and full history that has been written since that time, and present experience — the living and abundant testimony of our own days, give to the Saviour's words an application more striking even than that which they first bore. His assertion admits of forcible illustration; as its general meaning is, that men are ready to be duped, deceived, or controlled by error, or at least by partial and imperfect truth, while they will not dare the ventures of a faith, which requires humility and reliance in its reception, though it bear sufficient and entire truth in its message. We shall attempt to illustrate this assertion by a reference to the dissensions, the speculations, and even the philanthropic efforts, which prevail throughout Christendom.

The sects and dissensions which prevail in the Christian world have verified the assertion of the Saviour. They make his name and authority secondary to some other title or claim. They propose Christianity without Christ. Most of the Christian sects bear the names or rest upon the sanction of some human leaders. There is a Papal Church, an Athanasian Creed, a Lutheran Confession, a Calvinistic Catechism, a Wesleyan Connexion, a Campbellite Fellowship, a Swedenborgian Communion, and there are disciples of Joe Smith. Not one of these sects would yield up the name of Christ; but if asked individually of their belief, they would be sure to mention some patron's name with his, if not before it. Now it is not possible that this confusion of titles should exist without obscuring or impairing the authority of Christ, and mingling something with Christianity which is not Christianity. They sever the affection and interest of Christians from the Author and Finisher of our faith. They cause him, like that best altar-stone

which stood in all Athens, inscribed to the Unknown God, to be neglected for the sake of the shining statues of polished marble which all have titles. There is an application of the Saviour's words, strict and literal, to the dissensions and distinctions prevalent among Christians. Jesus coming in the name of the Father does not find that to be definite enough with many of his disciples. His sign must be countersigned before it can have currency. Other individuals come in their own names; they owe whatever good effect and wholesome influence they may work, to that portion of Christian truth which they may make the basis of their teaching. And such as these are received and followed.

A professed Christian may go with the name of his Master for his proffered pass-word and seek communion at the sacramental feast where he is commemorated, and yet be refused such fellowship: he must speak some other name, some human title, or stand aside. Amid the enterprises now undertaken in the facilities of intercourse, it would be no strange thing if piety should unite with curiosity and romance, to induce some believer in Christ to make a complete tour amid the lands and churches where his faith is professed. Such a traveller might rest at intervals every Lord's day, and enter a different place of worship each week, and he would need to mention the names of as many founders of sects, poor, erring fellow-disciples like himself, as there are Sundays in the year, or at least to assent to their peculiar views, to ensure himself admission to the Lord's table. The Lord's table! That has indeed long since lost in many quarters the Saviour's name, and has ceased to speak his free invitation. Custom has made us familiar with the substitution of human names for the Christian name, so that we do not marvel at it, but it is marvellous, and it is far from being harmless in its influence on our common Christian faith. Religious truths and lessons are thus severed from their only proper sanction, their only sufficient authority. An attempt is made to receive Christianity without first receiving Christ, the teacher and pattern of Christianity. Other names are put before his, and sometimes his name is omitted altogether. The blessings which he has assured to the soul and to the world are held as if by some other tenure than that of faith in him, and he is not acknowledged as he should be.

Some, however, may affirm that each sect intends, though it may bear the name of a human leader, to attach to Jesus Christ his full honor, and that all its distinguishing tenets are merely subsidiary to this end. Be the intention what it may, such is not the effect of the naming and labeling of contending sects. They confuse and embarrass popular opinions, they make all Christian union impossible, they introduce animosities among disciples, they have made the world to groan with a gathered mass of controversies, and have uttered a lively commentary upon the Saviour's warning to his followers — "Be not ye called masters."

For the great evil attending this substitution of human names for the name of the Master is yet to be mentioned. Jesus came in the name of his Father, other teachers have come in their own names, and all the difference that is found between the teachers and the names with which they have come, is found also in their doctrines. Hence have grown human creeds and formularies. If these contain more than has the sanction of the Master, or less, then they are not allowable: if they contain the same, then there is no need of them. Hence have sprung the rites and ceremonies, and institutions, and discipline which make the very essence of so many sects. We know what importance is attached to them severally in different Communions, and we know too that all the stress which is laid upon them is at the expense of plainer articles of faith and practice. The name of St. Athanasius is attached to a creed, which in a short space manages to conflict with every science and every authorised principle known to man. It is ungrammatical, unmathematical, unreasonable, unphilosophical, unscriptural and unintelligible. That Creed is enjoined upon the faith of millions. It begins with the assertion, that whoever will not believe it shall without doubt "perish everlastingly." Yet it does not contain a single article common to it and the sermon on the Mount, which closes with the Saviour's own promise that whoever hears and obeys it, builds his house upon a rock. Truly the beginning of the one document conflicts with the end of the other. They bear very different names. They cannot both be received together. Yet the reception of that creed, where it is made (as it *is* made) of vital importance, must confuse many who would receive Christ in the name

of the Father, without being compelled to receive Athanasius with him or before him.

Again, the Swedenborgian tells us that there is a hidden sense beneath the literal sense of Scripture. The search for this must take time and thought and effort needed for learning and obeying the literal sense. The literal sense rests upon the authority of Christ. The hidden sense rests upon the authority of Swedenborg. On which of these two senses do the Swedenborgians lay the chief stress; which has the greater interest for them? If they were satisfied with the literal sense, they would be content to call themselves Christians, and would put no other name before, or beside that of Christ. But if they will adopt also the internal sense, they must also take the name of the man on whose alleged commission to teach it the authority of that internal sense depends. We have indeed been assured by a disciple of the so called New Church, that he was and should have remained an unbeliever, had it not been for the writings of that learned and amiable Swedish baron. We could not but reply to this remark, that there was certainly great propriety in the adoption of the term Swedenborgian by him who made it, for that title in his case could not but stand before the title of Christian.

So indeed might we take the peculiar sentiments of each and every sect which rests on creeds, human titles and formularies and rites, and show how in some thing they receive a human teacher in his own name. This never can be done without perplexing the essentials of Christian faith, or increasing the effort of belief and obedience, or making of secondary importance the authority of him who came in the name of the Father. Though we might abundantly fortify these positions by a large reference to past and present experience, yet we must leave this first form of Christianity without Christ, because of others at least as remarkable. Let us however recognise the manifest obligation of keeping the supreme authority of Christ attached to his own religion; and of distinguishing between what he taught in the name of the Father, and that which others teach in their own names.

We pass to another attempt to appropriate and enjoy the blessings of Christianity under some other name than that of Christ. Let this illustration be drawn from some

of the speculations which have been entertained among Christians, and it will be found very fertile.

Religion has for ages been distinguished, in its lessons and its evidences, under the division of natural and revealed. This is a distinction with a difference. By natural religion is meant all of faith and duty, all of truth and hope, which the outward universe, the course of events, and the unaided reason of man will teach. By revealed religion is meant all the exposure of dangerous, though prevailing and established errors, all the confirmation of supposed and imagined truths, and all the addition of new or undiscovered truths, and all the new applications, uses and sanctions of all truths, which have been given to the world through the life and lessons of a child of God miraculously endowed. Such is a distinction which once was as clear to the minds of men as the difference between light and darkness. Ancient books record the sum of natural religion, and the date when revealed religion intermingled its new teachings. Natural religion embraces what many men have learned by their own inquiries, and have taught in their own names. Revealed religion embraces what was taught by Jesus Christ in the name of the Father. The lapse of time, the influences of long use, and more than all, the harmony of truth have well nigh blended the lessons taught by both forms of religion. But the distinction may still be distinguished. Cunning artifice may confound them, but watchful criticism and candid truth will keep them apart.

Now it has long been the effort, designed or undesigned, of those who bear the title of philosophical unbelievers, to merge the lessons of revelation in the revelations of nature. That is, they will either reject what Jesus Christ taught in the name of the Father, or they will receive what they please of it because they can teach it in their own names. With great positiveness has the position been assumed, that the pages of nature and the consciousness and intellect of man are adequate to make known and to confirm all of moral and religious and spiritual truth that is found in the religion of Christ. If this assertion could be sustained, it would not be the undoing of Christianity; but it would detract from the dignity and authority of the Founder of Christianity. It would give to every student of nature and

every philosopher the right to set his name in rivalry with that of our Lord and Master.

But let us see how this attempt at resolving revelation into natural religion is pursued, and let us question its method.

We have very many treatises on Natural Religion, understanding that phrase in its widest sense, as embracing the study of God's works, the phenomena of nature, the consciousness of man, and the experience of man's life. These treatises, or materials for them, form a large portion of the literature of all lands and of all people, through all time. All that we now possess relating to natural religion more or less closely, may be divided into two parts, one part including that which was written before the introduction of Christianity, the other embracing what has been written since that event, whether by those who, like Wollaston and Durham and Butler and Paley and others, have been Christians, or by those who, living under the influences of Christianity, have been philosophical unbelievers, or as the same persons seem now to prefer to be called, philosophical believers. Now the only proper way to decide what Natural Religion will teach us, and all that it will teach, is to take that part which was written on the subject before the birth of Christ. There are two sufficient reasons for this restriction. The first reason is, that the works and operations of nature, the providence of God, the heart, mind and experience of man—which are the materials of natural religion—were all as available before the birth of Christ as now, and there were men of as mighty intellect then as there have been since, to use them. The other reason for restricting the compass of natural religion to what it taught before the birth of Christ is, that since his birth his teachings have in ten thousand ways, sensibly and insensibly, directly and indirectly, influenced the thoughts and the lives of men; his teachings have been almost inseparably confounded and identified with our common thoughts and feelings, our instinctive convictions, and our natural rules of duty.

Restricting then the sum of what Natural Religion will teach to what it did teach or has taught in times before the Saviour, or in regions or islands where he has not yet been revealed, we can readily estimate how much men can teach

in their own names. We may leave unnoticed all those barbarous and hideous devices, all those gross and brutalising superstitions, and all those innocent and fanciful conceptions, which have prevailed as religion in Pagan continents and isles, and we may take the writings and the lives of the noblest men in the most civilized nations of antiquity, as the issues of natural religion.

We have before us the writings and teachings of Homer and Hesiod, of Socrates and Plato, of Cicero and Plutarch, and a few others, and we find that their wisdom, their characters, their lives, and their sorrows, lacked just those views, virtues, lessons and hopes which the revelation of Jesus Christ has brought to millions and millions of the humblest children of God. Cicero sat in his elegant country-seat, on the lovely shore of the Mediterranean, near the spot which Heathen taste chose as the earthly representation of Elysium or heaven, and there, with all the honors of a republic hung upon his brows, and all the wisdom of his age at his service, he wept and mourned in his declining days the death of a beloved daughter, dearest to him of all that the earth included. There, he himself tells us, he read every piece of written parchment which he could meet with on the subject of moderating grief. There he received letters of consolation from such noble friends, and such eminent Romans, as Cæsar and Brutus, and Lucceius and Sulpicius. But they were letters which did not reach to the woe of his heart, nor suggest the hope which now beams over the humblest Christian death-bed. The only solace of his grief he found in the purpose of erecting to the memory of his daughter a costly temple, where she might receive for her virtues a semi-idolatrous worship from his and her friends. Has not every one whose eye may fall on these remarks beheld sufferers in lonely homes, without wealth or honors, visited with ten-fold more of woe than that great Roman endured, yet sustained by a faith which cometh not of philosophy or man's wisdom? And what was Natural Religion then — what did it teach, not only of hope in death, but of duty in life? Did it then contain the lessons of revelation?

Now a class of writers, called Philosophical Unbelievers, Infidels, or Free Thinkers, made it quite fashionable in England a century ago, to take the belief of simple

Deism, but to embrace under that belief the substance of revelation, not however as coming through Jesus Christ in the name of the Father, but as certified by their own names. Some of the treatises written by these men, on what they called the Religion of Nature, are exceedingly beautiful and impressive. In their admiration of Christian doctrines and views of life, and in the spontaneous assent and approbation of their minds to Christian truths, they fell into the delusion of supposing that they had discovered and wrought them all out from the light of nature. They resemble those described by Milton, who in their approbation of a discovery wondered that they themselves had not made it: —

> "The invention all admired, and each how he
> To be the inventor missed;—so easy it seemed,
> Once found, which yet unfound, most would have thought
> Impossible."

Christianity had been breathed in by those writers from the atmosphere around them, its spirit and its lessons glide gently from their pens, they are earnest in maintaining that all that man needs to believe and know and do is signified by the pages of Natural Religion, and they are just as earnestly engaged in writing those pages over with transcripts from the New Testament. They are indebted to the Bible for their natural religion, as much as Kamehameha III., the King of the Sandwich Islands, would be if he were to undertake to write a treatise on religion of any sort.

Among ourselves too, here and there may be found a person who does the same as did those Deists, teaching Christianity without Christ, and sometimes even religion without God, because he relucts at admitting the miraculous sanction of religion. Such persons prefer to substitute their own names and theories to accepting the special authority of Christ, though they would freely appropriate to themselves what he taught. We will not attach any bad name to this violation of a rule which was well established before the rights of inventors and discoverers and the law of patents were settled. Call it an eccentricity, or at worst a delusion. They who thus appropriate the teachings of Christ as their own intuitions, and put their own names before his, forget that they owe all to Christianity; they may forget how they have learned what they know, and what sacred

example of faith first revealed to them the realms of belief and taught their spirits to soar. They forget that they once stood by the knee of a Christian mother to hear of Christ. They forget all the little hymns, the Sunday services of youth, and the thousand influences which have wrought upon them in life. There is ingratitude to Christ, there is peril to the sincerity and the character of the philosopher or speculatist, in thus substituting a mortal name for the name of Christ. To such a deplorable length has this wrong been carried in some quarters, that we may say, even 'the withered hand which Christ has restored and made whole has been lifted up against him; the dumb man's tongue, just loosened from the bonds of silence, has mocked the power that set it free.' Speculation, free and rash speculation, under the name of philosophy, has given a literal fulfilment of the Saviour's reproach, that other names would be preferred to his.

While the dissensions and the speculations of those who walk in the light and enjoy the blessings of Christ do thus verify his own reproach, by putting other names and sanctions before that which he offered, the same wrong is exemplified in the *practice* of Christians. Even philanthropy, Christian philanthropy, has parted with the name of Christ. Those deeds of benevolence done to others which he expressly said he regarded as done to himself, are now urged apart from his name and authority. Some of our reformers have indeed given up the spirit and the title of Christians. Some wonderful facts present themselves here for our notice. Jesus Christ designed that his Church should be a vast institution of holiness, charity and mercy, that all should be its members who were actuated by these sentiments, and that all should receive their kind deeds, who were in any sort of necessity or suffering. This is the Christian Church: embracing every good man, and every good work—with open arms, with free invitations, with an unbounded charity, with the promise of a blessing from on high. This institution, with the sacred name of Christ upon it, languishes, but there spring up all around it institutions designed to do a part of his work—not called by his name, but entitled the Orders of Free Masons, of Odd Fellows, of Rechabites, etc. We know nothing of these institutions save what they publish to the world. We say

nothing against them, for we believe they are doing good in some measure. Some whom we esteem as friends and brethren, approve them and join with them. We have indeed passed upon them the highest praise by saying, as we have said, that they are designed to do a part of the Saviour's great work of holiness, redemption and love. More we cannot say in their praise, for their invention of names and sanctions for their work and organizations seems to us to run in opposition to the name of Christ, and to confine them to only a part of the work, of which he enjoined the whole. The Christian name is enough, and if another name is substituted for it, part of the Christian work will be omitted. For observe now, how this multiplication of Societies, each with its fancy title and designed for partial Christian works, affects the great institution and the great work which bear the name of Christ with authority from the Father. A minister may spend his best strength, his zeal, and his prayers in endeavoring to impress upon his hearers the obligations and duties of a Christian life. He tells them of Christ who went about doing good, and holds him forth as their example; he reads to them that striking chapter in the gospel of Matthew, where Jesus Christ assumes the condition of the sick, the naked, the stranger and the prisoner; he teaches them in the name of Christ, that all men are their brethren and have a claim on every service they can pay; he shows how every sacred hope, and every holy duty, and every work of purity and mercy is embraced in a Christian life; and then the minister urges his hearers to take upon them the Christian name, and go forth and be faithful to it in life. His appeals fall coldly year after year upon many persons. But some of those who will not take upon them the name of Christ and go forth in that name, will take upon them the name of some Society, and with that name will own each other as brethren. Not as Christians, then, but as members of one or another Order, we find them leagued together, visiting a fellow-member in his suffering, addressing him as "worthy Brother," supplying all his wants with the tenderest solicitude, watching by him in the closest friendship, and hailing his return again to the weekly or monthly meeting of the Order. All this is of the very essence of Christianity. It would not have been done without Christianity. Why

not then call it Christianity? Why give to it a fancy name? Why dissever from any Christian work, or league, or union, that venerable and sacred name which all generations of men are to bless? If Christianity prompts the work of mercy, let Christianity have the credit of it before the whole world. Let not the minds of a rising generation be perplexed and deceived, by finding the work of redemption which Christ has inspired going on by portions here and there, under titles which would better become a nursery for children than the wide, open world of serious and suffering men.

We have hinted that when Christian works are undertaken without the constant guidance and the attending name of Jesus Christ, those works may be but partially performed. Is there not danger of this? We know what answer Jesus gave to the question, — who is my neighbor? That answer was founded on his idea of the universal brotherhood of man, on the equal claim of every brother man to our sympathy in his necessities. Is there not danger lest the members of our fancy Societies put in the names of the brethren of their Orders, as the first and the best, if not the only answer to the question, "who is my neighbor?" We would not imply, that the members of these fraternities restrict their good deeds to their several circles. We know indeed that this charge would be unjust, and that these fraternities have even bestowed aid in their united capacity simply as charity, without reference to the claims of its recipients. But Christendom has for ages acknowledged the beautiful moral of the parable of the good Samaritan to be, that in any work of mercy the claim of humanity goes forth with equal eloquence and with equal demand from every sufferer, and that there can be no "preferred debts" to be recognised by Christian charity. We are pained to see the sublime moral of that parable brought under any risk of forgetfulness, or any diminution of authority, by the recognition of a principle which says that patronage and relief shall regard any associate claims, save those of domestic relationship or of the wide brotherhood of the race.

Besides, the more popular and the more pretending these partial organizations may be, the greater is the expense of supporting them with appropriate paraphernalia,

and with outlays of time and money which go not at all to the relief of suffering, nor to the education of mind or heart. The philosophic Hallam sums up much wisdom and experience in the assertion, that "mankind has generally required some ceremonial follies to keep alive the wholesome spirit of association." This is true, and it is equally true, that the ceremonies, decorations and paraphernalia of associations will generally be an index of the measure of truth, practical wisdom and utility which such associations may claim for their grounds and ends. The baptismal water and the sacramental cup are the simple and sole elements of mere ceremony which were associated from the beginning with our Christian faith, and even these, though full of expression and meaning, have been found objectionable to some of the purest Christians that the world has known. The moment when the ceremonial of the Church began to increase, was the moment when the truth which it had dispensed began to decrease. Throughout all the associations of the middle and subsequent centuries, from the Church down to the pettiest guild or craft of the pettiest village, "ceremonial follies" were invariably the indices of greater or less degrees of utility, of truth and of practical wisdom in those associations.

That we may not be misunderstood, let us again state distinctly the objection we urge against several of our modern associations. It is not that they do not aim at, or accomplish any good. We admit that they do a measure of good. The social meetings of their members may tend to cultivate social feelings, their acts of charity must greatly relieve suffering. Nor do we object now to these Societies, that they have secret bonds of union, nor that the members might be disposed to favor one another in courts of justice, in political elections, and in private dealings. Neither do we object to these Societies, that they offer inducements to the unworthy to seek admittance to them from unworthy motives. Nor lastly, do we urge the general objection applicable to any place or occasion, be it a dram-shop, a reading-room, or a club, which takes men regularly from their families, and offers them a more attractive place than their homes for finding interest and enjoyment after the labors of the day. We object to these Societies solely on Christian grounds. They give up the name of Christ for

a fanciful, if not a silly name of their own. They make charity an obligation peculiarly due to fellow-members, instead of extending it equally and irrespectively to all sufferers, without any favor or distinction, according to the parable of the good Samaritan. They take out the very life from the rule proposed in that parable, and substitute for it the ancient method of Spartan hospitality.

Is there not some little deception too, in thus putting away the name of Christ, and in trying to do without his sanction, and by an improved method, the very work which he proposed and consecrated, and of which he gave the all-sufficient and the only sufficient rule? For see what would be the result in a few years, if the tendencies which have been to such a degree developed were still to strengthen themselves. The next generation coming on to the stage of life would find the Christian Church a deserted and lifeless, or merely a lingering and ineffective institution, clung to only by a few women who are denied admission to our modern Societies, while some really Christian works, and the very work which the Christian Church set in motion, would be going on here and there, by portions, in the community under sham or fictitious titles, and some other Christian works would be neglected altogether, because the name and sanction of the Master had fallen into disrepute. We are well aware, that some may meet these objections by alleging that the Church does not fulfil the purpose of its Founder, by laboring as a great benevolent institution and performing its work of mercy independently of all human distinctions. To this plea we are content to reply, that it therefore becomes every Christian believer to give all his zeal and labor towards turning the Church back to its true work and purpose, instead of aiding in its perversion by forsaking its one great tent for some petty encampment which would set up rival claims.

But it may be asked, if the objection which we have urged against some of these modern Societies, would not apply equally to all charitable associations, such as the "Howard Benevolent Society," "the Fatherless and Widows' Society," etc. We answer, No. These last Societies take names only to designate the particular objects of their Christian charity, and to define the specific form and kind of suffering which they would relieve. They are

not bounded by oaths of fellowship or membership. They have no expensive paraphernalia, no childish devices, no wordy titles, no absurd mummeries. Their organization and their occasional appearance before the public are associated with Christian faith and Christian sanctions, with Christian appeals in Christian churches.

If any one should further ask, whether the objections thus urged against some modern Orders, do not arise from professional jealousy; we answer, Yes! They spring entirely from professional jealousy, and they justify themselves entirely on the grounds of professional jealousy; that profession being a Christian profession, and that jealousy being a desire that Jesus Christ should have the credit of his own work in this world, and that that work should be wholly, not partially, performed. We confess that professional jealousy has dictated our objections, and we have not the least anxiety to disguise, but would prefer to declare it.

In view of all these fraternities leagued in amity to regard their own members as first and chiefly brethren, we might indeed say with St. Paul, "notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice." Let all these good works be done, but let them be done in the name of Christ. The inspiring purpose, the kindling spirit, the guiding law, the promised blessing is his. If it be only the least gift mentioned by himself, the giving of "a cup of cold water," or the visiting of the sick, "whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

We have felt justified in making this reference to the various Societies for doing Christian works, which have put aside the Christian name for less worthy names of their own. Our purpose has not been to heap offence or reproach upon them; we have aimed at something better. We have been solicited to join several of them, and as professed Christians we have made that profession a ground of refusal. We will join none of them, because we have already joined one that is greater and better than them all, and which includes what is good in them all. On the same principle we have purchased an Encyclopedia of established reputation, and embracing the whole circle of

literature and the sciences, and therefore do not feel obliged to purchase separately the many little books which contain reprints of the whole, or of portions, of its single articles. We do indeed belong to all of these benevolent Societies, and to all there shall ever be of them, ten, twenty, or a thousand years after we shall have been buried; because we belong to the Christian Church. Nor can any religious truth, nor any religious duty be made the basis of union among men, which is not recognized in the Christian Church, and which will not bind to eternity all its members. We would say nothing unkind or harsh about the fraternities around us and in our midst, but we object to them, that while doing a Christian work, they yield up the precious and quickening name of the Lord Jesus. Thus is society all around us made to present the strange aspect of appearing to be giving up all reverence for Jesus Christ, while spending redoubled and gigantic efforts in the very work which he appointed, and with the very instruments of which he taught the use. Christianity is thus cunningly deprived of its most earnest and irresistible claim to our regard. For the most efficacious testimony to Christianity is its influence on the world, in our cities, in our villages, in the relations of life, in our hospitals and our charitable institutions. Let them all keep the name which has been given to them in Christian baptism, even if they feel disposed to add to it titles of incorporation by the Legislature. Else when our children succeed us, they may hear of Christ from pulpits as a kind of mythological personage, while all the good which is done in the world, though attributable to his instigation, neglects that sacred name, to assume the numberless designations of clan, or sect, or party. There is a power even in the associations of titles. There is wisdom in retaining the connection between an effort and the spring which renews that effort, in attaching the key to the watch, in chaining the bucket to the well; there is gratitude in handing down the name of a benefactor with the gift which he has bestowed in perpetuity; and there is only simple justice in connecting Christ with Christianity.

The reference which we have made to sects, to speculations, and even to philanthropic efforts, will at least show some justification for the title which we have prefixed to these remarks. Christianity is sufficient for man, in all its

lessons and offices and duties. So sufficient is it, that all sects, and all speculations, and all benevolent enterprises are indebted to it for their measure of truth and power, though by rivalry of new names they have a tendency to conceal from many the indisputable fact, that Christianity is the one great support of the faith, hope, and charity of the world. This fact, so grateful to every Christian heart, so eloquent in its truth, so hopeful in its promises, cannot be denied even by the skeptic. Let it not then be hidden from us by the substitution of any other name for that of Christ, or of any less agency for that of his Gospel.

G. E. E.

ART. VIII. — LIFE AND CHARACTER OF DR. WARE.*

THE professional life of Dr. Ware, including his ministry at Hingham and his professorship at Cambridge, was extended over an unusual term of years, and, both in the events with which it was connected and in the character it displayed, presents no common subject for reflection. He was chosen as the Hollis Professor in 1805 after a ministry of nearly eighteen years, and remained in the active discharge of the duties of that professorship until 1840, making together a period of fifty-three years, and of his academic life "a longer term than was ever rendered by any President of the college, or any Professor except two."† It is seldom, that such a period of active or professional service is permitted to any one: still more rarely is it filled with like fidelity and usefulness. It was, therefore, with the utmost propriety that the University, which had enjoyed so long the benefit of his services, should desire some worthy commemoration of them; and we are happy that

* *A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Rev. Henry Ware D. D., A. A. S., late Hollis Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, pronounced in the First church in Cambridge, September 28th. 1845. By* JOHN G. PALFREY D. D. LL. D. formerly Professor of Biblical Literature in the University. Cambridge: J. Owen. 1845. 8vo. pp. 38.

† The Presidency of Mr. Edward Holyoke was of nearly thirty-two years. The Professorship of the first Dr. Wigglesworth extended from 1721 to 1765, or forty-four years; and that of Dr. Winthrop from 1738 to 1779, or forty-one years.

this honorable duty was devolved on one, whose opportunities of observation, both as a pupil and an associate Professor in the Seminary, fully qualified him for a task, which he has discharged with characteristic judgment and felicity.

"I feel it to be my privilege," says Dr. Palfrey in the opening of his Discourse, "to express in your behalf, as best I may, that estimation, which I share with very many, of the worth and services of an excellent man, several years my revered instructer, and several years my respected and beloved colleague in academical labors. Dr. Ware's was a character of mark. In those walks of life to which my observation has extended, I have known few minds so sagacious: none more firm, more clearly balanced, more candid, or more just. Its influence has operated extensively. * * * And if his life cannot be called eventful, its course has been closely connected with a succession of events of the strongest interest to the friends of science and of Christianity." — p. 6.

From this memoir, and some other sources, we learn that Henry Ware was born April 1, 1764, in the town of Sherburne, Mass., of parents in moderate circumstances, with a naturally feeble constitution, which by tender maternal care gradually acquired strength; and that he was left fatherless at fifteen years of age, with a patrimony of between three and four hundred dollars. His advantages of early education were exceedingly small, but he soon gave promise of the gifts that were afterward so happily developed; and with the assistance of his elder brothers, who had sense to discern and generosity to encourage his progress, was placed under the care of Rev. Mr. Brown, the minister of the parish, for whom his pupil cherished through life a most grateful remembrance; and having been admitted as a Freshman in Cambridge in 1781, he was graduated with the first honors of his class in 1785.

The same carefulness and propriety of deportment which marked the man, distinguished him as a pupil. "He never once incurred a fine, or any other punishment at the hands of the Faculty;" and that this honorable course was at no sacrifice of his popularity with his class-mates, is evident from the honors they bestowed upon him, and particularly by their appointment of him as their Valedictory Orator. Having completed his academic studies, he immediately entered upon the charge of the grammar

school at Cambridge, at the same time pursuing his theological studies and preparing himself for the ministry. He began to preach on the first of April, 1787, in the pulpit of the pastor and friend of his youth; and in the October following, within little more than two years from the time of leaving College, was ordained as Pastor of the First Church of Hingham; being the successor of the venerable Dr. Gay, whose able ministry in that place was protracted to the unusual, and almost unprecedented period of sixty-nine years.

In a few memoranda of his early life, written in his old age, and quoted by Dr. Palfrey, we see under what disadvantages, at that crisis of our Commonwealth, the Collegiate education must have been pursued; and the humble estimate, which in the retrospect Dr. Ware was willing to form of his own acquirements. "I can look back," says he, "upon my College life with but a limited degree of satisfaction." It belonged however to the native modesty of his spirit to take humble measures of himself; and the imperfection of his education and the brief term of his preparatory studies were amply compensated by the excellent gifts that were in him. His youthful tastes and habits, the whole character of his mind, and — what could not be without their effect — his personal qualities, adapted him well to the profession of his choice. From the first he was an instructive preacher; through the whole term of his ministry he was a devoted pastor; his praise was in the churches; his presence was welcomed in other parishes; and when, after more than seventeen years, he was called to the Professorship at Cambridge, the regrets of his people, expressed in terms of affection far exceeding the usual decorum of such communications, and evinced ever after by their continued interest in his welfare, gave unequivocal evidence of the place he held in their hearts.*

In 1789 Dr. Ware married a daughter of Rev. Jonas Clarke of Lexington,† a clergyman respected in his day, and distinguished above the multitude of his brethren as

* See Address from the first Church in Hingham to the Rev. Henry Ware on the dissolution of his pastoral connexion with them, with his answer and Farewell Discourse.

† With the mention of Mr. Ware's early settlement and marriage at Hingham, his eulogist connects some valuable remarks on the too com-

well by his liberal hospitalities as by the extraordinary length of his public services. Of the ten children born of this marriage, Henry was the eldest son, and four daughters died in their infancy. The same wisdom, fidelity and just views of life and duty, pervading the whole course of Dr. Ware, were eminently conspicuous in his domestic relations, in which signal felicities were at different periods not unattended by heavy trials. He was a most wise and judicious parent, natural fondness being ever controlled by the soberest judgment. In the beautiful memoir of Henry Ware Jr. by his brother, Dr. John Ware, just issued from the press, we find this part of his character exhibited in a very attractive light. In adverting to an early period of his brother's life, his biographer says,

"He was much aided in his escape from the dangers of his age and situation by the continuance, in some degree, of the same parental guidance which had already done so much to give him a right tendency. It was the custom of his father to keep up as frequent a communication with his children, when they were absent from him, as the pressure of other duties would permit; and his letters, though not consisting of regular and labored admonitions, seldom failed to contain some hints or short expositions with regard to modes and objects of study, the cultivation of good habits, or attention to moral and religious duties, which probably had the more effect from their incidental character, and this very absence of formality."

The good influences exerted by this faithful parent were all happily seconded by those of his wife, a wise and pious mother, to whose many excellencies her son has paid a grateful tribute in the memoir from which we have made this extract. Her influence, however, was destined to be brief.

---

mon imprudence of young men entering the clerical profession, in entangling themselves with matrimonial engagements; and quotes from Mr. Ware's memoranda some slight admission of his own "want of forethought and calculation" in this regard. Both the remarks and the admission bear token of the wisdom we should have anticipated from such sources and on such a theme. But inasmuch as the marriage, that occasioned the caution, proved altogether felicitous, except in its too early dissolution, we much fear that our young men, tempted to like alliances, will prefer the hazard of imitating the example to the prudence of adopting the counsel. There are few subjects, indeed, of like interest to the sons of men, in which the efficiency of the soundest advice seems liable to more uncertainty than this; instances never being wanting of grave and worthy gentlemen, within and without the church, whose unexceptionable judgment in other matters has been found in the least possible harmony with their actual history in this.

Mrs. Ware died within a few weeks after the removal of her family from Hingham to Cambridge, and the fond hopes which her husband had cherished of her improving health under the change of their condition were disappointed. But nothing prevailed to shake the firmness of his reliance, or his unwavering trust. The following scene is related by Dr. John Ware in the memoir to which we have referred, and presents a most lively image at once of the calm submission and the paternal faithfulness, which under every circumstance he never failed to exhibit.

"On the day of her funeral our father gathered his children together into the room where she lay, and when they were by themselves, surrounding her coffin, himself calm and tranquil, spoke to them of the mother they had lost; of what she had done, and suffered for them; of her example and instructions; the influence which this event should have upon their lives, and above all, in making them feel the uncertainty of this life, and the duty of preparing for another. The impression made by this scene was of the most solemn and permanent kind, for now, at the distance of forty years, it comes back to the mind with much of the distinctness of a recent event."

We have ourselves a distinct recollection of the deportment of Dr. Ware on this occasion. He had recently passed through the trial of parting with a beloved flock, and breaking up some cherished associations. He was just entering on an untried and arduous field of duty, rendered more difficult by the bitterness of a theological zeal, of which he was of necessity, however innocently, made the object, and which, though it never dared to breathe a suspicion against his personal character, looked with an intense jealousy upon his course as the Hollis Professor of Divinity. And now, just at the moment when he had exchanged his pleasant home and cherished friendships at Hingham for a new abode and new friends at Cambridge, he was called to part with the wife of his youth and the mother of his six children, whose maternal care could at no period have been more important. He was as yet comparatively a stranger at Cambridge, and as the new Professor, whose appointment had been the occasion of so much division, his person and appearance were naturally the objects of some curiosity with the students. The Sunday following the death of Mrs. Ware was a tempest-

uous day, that might reasonably have detained from church a family under any affliction. It was therefore a spectacle not less edifying than at that time it was rare, to see this young family, while yet the wife and the mother lay unburied at home,* gathered at church with the widowed father at their head, and seeking there, where they may best be found, the strength and solace of prayer. The calm and firm deportment of Mr. Ware on this occasion could have been witnessed by no one without respect; and it may not improperly be mentioned, as among the evidences of the silent beneficial influence of a Christian example, that it impressed one mind at least, in a manner never forgotten, with a sense of the beauty and obligation of submission to the Divine pleasure, and with a sentiment of veneration for the individual exhibiting it, which advancing years and a growing acquaintance continually confirmed and deepened.

The appointment of Dr. Ware to the Hollis Professorship of Divinity in Cambridge University, was an epoch in the religious history of Massachusetts, and to a certain extent, of New England. In connexion with the institution of the Theological Seminary at Andover, and other events soon following, it produced that state of division in the Congregational churches, not unfelt by ministers of other denominations, which exists to the present day. It might be difficult for those who regard only the present aspect of affairs, to conceive of the intensity of interest, with which that appointment was viewed alike by friends and foes, or the vehemence of opposition it encountered from the latter. Then was urged all that has so often been repeated, and as often refuted since, of the orthodoxy of Mr. Hollis as making peremptory the obligation of choosing none but an "Orthodox" Professor. Then was witnessed that of which the history of recent times has not left us without other examples, — the amalgamation of Orthodoxy with politics, which seeks by mutual compromise the compassing of some party objects not otherwise to be obtained. The interval of eighteen months that had elapsed between the

* It was not customary at that time, for even the families of clergymen to attend church on a Sunday intervening between the death and the funeral of one of their members.

death of Dr. Tappan* and the choice of his successor, gave ample scope at once for the speculations and solicitudes of party. And when at length, in February, 1805, the nomination of Mr. Ware by the Corporation was submitted to the Overseers of the College for their approval, nothing was wanting either in the importance of the question to be decided, in the relations of the parties engaged, or in the state of the public mind in regard to them both, to awaken the keenest interest. Rev. Dr. Morse, then the minister of the Congregational church in Charlestown, and *ex officio* a member of the Board of Overseers, with others, his Orthodox associates, strenuously opposed the election. After much earnest discussion the question was decided by a vote of thirty-three in favor, and twenty-three opposed to the confirmation.

The objections that were urged to the appointment of Mr. Ware have been so often stated, and we must add, so clearly refuted,† that we may easily be excused from any discussion of the subject here. The objections themselves were of a theological nature, or were drawn from the supposed intentions of the Founder of the Hollis Professorship, while the character and qualifications of the candidate, so far as they were independent of his religious opinions, were treated, as has been already intimated, with a decorous respect. The divisions occasioned by his election, were never healed. The controversy was kept up by subsequent publications;‡ and through the whole term of Dr. Ware's Professorship, and even up to this day, a certain class of writers have not ceased to draw from it materials for complaint or accusation. Neither the ample evidence adduced of the liberal and catholic spirit of Mr. Hollis, evinced by his long and intimate friendship with his Unitarian pastor,

* Professor Tappan died August 27, 1803.

† See, among other publications to the same purpose, the Monthly Anthology for April, and May, 1805: the Christian Examiner, New Series, for September, 1829: a Letter, by Hon. Francis C. Gray, in relation to Harvard University, addressed to Governor Lincoln: and President Quincy's History of Harvard University, in which both the history of the Professorship, and the views of the Founder, Thomas Hollis Esq., are fully and fairly exhibited.

‡ The most prominent of these was that, entitled, "The true Reasons, on which the Election of a Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College was opposed at the Board of Overseers, February 14, 1805. By Jedediah Morse, D. D., Member of the Board of Overseers."

Dr. Hunt, whose counsel he sought in regard to his religious charities, and whom, after constant attendance on his ministry for fifteen years, he calls "a learned man and a critical and just expositor of the holy Scriptures;" nor the well-known liberality of the clergymen whom Mr. Hollis selected as his advisers, and who actually drew up for him at his own request the conditions and rules of his Professorship;* nor the catholic character of the "Form" itself as prescribed by Mr. Hollis to be agreed to by the Professor at his inauguration, in which, without the slightest mention of the Trinity or of any other controverted doctrine, he is only required to "declare it as his belief, that the Bible is the only and most perfect rule of faith and practice, and promise to explain and open the Scriptures to his pupils with integrity and faithfulness, according to the best light that God shall give him;" nor the opinions known to be entertained by the predecessors of Mr. Ware in the Professorship, "all of whom, with the exception perhaps of the elder Wigglesworth, are understood to have departed more or less from strict Calvinism;" nor yet the fact, that the funds of the Professorship were never adequate to its support, and that for many years four fifths of the Professor's salary were derived from the general funds of the College;—neither these, nor other arguments of like bearing, which from time to time were adduced, have prevailed to diminish the earnestness of opposition, or the untiring zeal, with which, upon every possible occasion, the government of the College has been charged with the perversion of its funds and unfaithfulness to the will of a Benefactor.†

* Of the seven friends of Mr. Hollis, who subscribed and recommended the "Rules and Orders," all but one had declared themselves (in the celebrated controversy of Salter's Hall on the subject of the Trinity) for liberality and catholicism; a majority were opposed to tests in any shape, even to the test of a party name; and two of them, at least, were Unitarians, viz. Dr. Hunt and Mr. Lowman.

† Even could it be shown,—what, considering Mr. Hollis's satisfaction with the ministry of Dr. Hunt, seems scarcely possible,—that his own views were Orthodox to the extent alleged, it by no means follows, that he was unwilling to establish a Professorship of Divinity on catholic principles. His whole conduct, whatever might have been his views upon controverted doctrines, was in the highest degree liberal. If he was a Calvinist or a Trinitarian, he chose Unitarians, with others of the most determined advocates of religious liberty, for his counsellors and friends. And what is yet more decisive of his singular liberality is, that,

"Meanwhile," says Dr. Palfrey, "the original subject of all this stir was devoting himself in tranquil retirement to the duties of his place. He took no part in the public discussion of doctrines till after several years, when the urgency of his friends, who were unwilling that so much calm wisdom, experience, and ability should fail to bring a tribute to what he and they esteemed so good a cause, so far overcame his natural diffidence as to prevail upon him to publish, in 1820, a volume entitled 'Letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists, occasioned by Dr. Woods's Letters to Unitarians,' which passed through three editions the same year, and drew in 1821 a reply from Dr. Woods. Dr. Ware continued the controversy by an answer to this work in 1822, and a 'Postscript' to the same the following year." — pp. 24, 25.

The interval that passed between his inauguration as Professor and the commencement of this controversy, was fruitful of events to the church and to the country. The establishment, in 1808, of the Theological Seminary at Andover, the effect, as we have intimated, of the division of the two prominent religious parties in consequence of his election; the organization of Park Street church, in 1809, with the express view of extending the influence of Orthodoxy in the city; the controversy, in 1815, between Dr. Channing and Dr. Worcester, a result doubtless of the state of religious sentiment that had been gradually produced, but immediately suggested by calumnious charges directed against the Liberal party, in the pages of the Panoplist; the establishment of the "Society for Promoting Theological Education in Harvard University," which in its prosperous beginning drew to its membership, and enlisted not less the zeal than the liberality of many distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth; and finally, the war of this country with Great Britain, naturally interesting all parties, and which by closing up the avenues to commerce was not without its effect upon the University, by adding to its classes many of our young men who would otherwise have chosen active pursuits; — all these events would naturally, in their turn, engage his attention, but none of them prevailed to withdraw him for a moment from the appropriate duties of his office. His self-respect would not suffer him

being a Baptist, he avoids all reference to this subject in his Rules for his Professorship, and only provides in relation to his scholarships, that "none be refused on account of his belief and practice of adult baptism."

to enter into any defence of the views, which the opponents of his election saw fit to denounce as heretical, and he properly left to others the refutation of charges, which, however groundless, bigotry and intolerance have never been slow to urge against the opinions and the measures of liberal Christians. He felt that sacred interests were entrusted to his hands; and with the devotion of the Jewish governor to his appropriate calling, he could say, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down. Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it and come down unto you?" His various duties, and the manner in which they were fulfilled, we cannot better describe than in the language of Dr. Palfrey's Discourse.

"As a prominent officer of the academical institution, he took his full interest and part in its internal administration, and in all its cares and concerns. He prepared, and read to the students, comprehensive and elaborate courses of lectures on the evidences, doctrines, and ethics of religion, and on the history and criticism of the records of revelation. He conducted the instruction of the classes in the text-books from time to time prescribed in those departments. To the routine of discipline he freely gave his time and wise attention; and the rare union in him of firmness, gentleness, and sound and careful judgment, made him a stable stay, on the one part, for authority to lean upon, and conciliated confidence and made obedience easy, on the other. After the establishment, in 1814, of the separate Lord's day worship in the College chapel, he punctually took his share in the pulpit service; a heavily laborious duty, when performed as he performed it, to one whose week has been crowded full with the tasks of instruction. When at two different times, after the death of President Webber, and the resignation of President Kirkland, he was invested with the temporary government of the College, it prospered beneath his care." — pp. 25, 26.

In no notices, however brief of the services and virtues of Dr. Ware — since it was the occasion of exhibiting both — may we omit the part which he bore in the controversy with Professor Woods of Andover, to which Dr. Palfrey alludes in the extract on our last page. Upon the publication of Dr. Channing's discourse at the Ordination of Mr. Sparks at Baltimore, in 1819, a series of Letters was addressed to the author by Professor Stuart, controverting his statements especially in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity. These were soon followed by "Letters to Unitarians,"

occasioned by the same discourse, by Professor Woods, vindicating the doctrines of Calvinism. To the publication of Professor Stuart a full and elaborate reply appeared in the "Christian Disciple" of 1819, well understood to be from the pen of Mr. Norton of Cambridge.* To the Letters of Dr. Woods, Professor Ware, who, as we have seen, had now for full fifteen years been quietly discharging the duties of his place, was persuaded by his friends to reply, and afterwards to publish a rejoinder to Dr. Woods's examination of his volume. The controversy itself excited to an unusual degree the public interest. The part taken by Professor Ware was in the highest degree honorable to the gifts and temper of the author. For clear and ingenuous statement, for condensed and pertinent illustration, for reverence of truth, with candor and dignity in asserting it, his work has not been surpassed in the history of religious controversy. And they who would seek for a vindication of primitive Christianity, or a model of the spirit, generous and free, reverent and kind, with which it should be maintained, will not fail to find them here.

With the establishment, in 1816, of the Divinity School in Cambridge, the labors and responsibleness of Dr. Ware were greatly increased. Before this period, the resident students in Divinity were accustomed to receive from the Hollis Professor and from the President of the University some general assistance in the prosecution of their studies, but excepting a course of exercises voluntarily undertaken by Professor Ware in 1811, no systematic instruction had been expected or given. Through the instrumentality of the Society for Promoting Theological Education funds were obtained for a more regular and permanent system; and from that time until his resignation in 1840, comprising nearly a quarter of a century, the services of Dr. Ware, as a member of the Theological Faculty, and instructor in the Divinity School, were of the highest value. Here, his industry, fidelity, and sound judgment, conspicuous everywhere, found their fullest exercise, and, united

* See *Christian Disciple* for August and September, 1819. Because these articles were in the form of a review, not distinctly assuming the name of a Reply, it was pretended by the friends of Mr. Stuart, that his Letters, notwithstanding the learning and signal ability of the review, were never answered.

with the singular fairness of his mind, earnest love of truth, and freedom from every form of dogmatism, could not fail to command the confidence and respect of all who were within the circle of his influence. "The candor of his mind," says Dr. Palfrey, "was remarkable. He trusted truth enough to give error every fair chance. Who ever knew him unjust to an adverse statement, or heard him sharpen an argument with a taunt." His fairness in the weighing of evidence and in exhibiting the arguments or objections of an opponent were proverbial with the students; so that within the walls of the College, where, with the natural liveliness of youth, great truths are sometimes shadowed forth under playful imagery, he was known by an appellation familiarly expressive of his scrupulous impartiality. They who from without imagined, or insinuated — and such were not wanting — that he could avail himself of the opportunities of his position or of the weight of his character to impress unduly his own opinions, or to make converts to his faith, little understood the man, and yet less the generous and elevated spirit, in which the whole system of instruction in the School was conducted. In an Address delivered before the Society for Promoting Theological Education by the author of the Discourse before us, this system is faithfully described as unlike that of every other institution of the kind, in permitting "no restriction to be placed on the freest Scriptural inquiry on the part either of pupil or of teacher. * * * It neither calls upon the young men themselves, nor sets to them the bad example of requiring their guides, to submit their faith to human dictation; to profess their subjection to formularies of man's device; least of all, to engage to follow the light, which the book of divine truth may disclose, no further than to a prescribed point."

Such were the principles, to which Professor Ware conscientiously adhered in the fulfilment of his duties, both in the College and the School. And that these principles had their full operation and were left to their natural effects, is sufficiently proved by the diversities of speculation that from time to time found place among the students, and the indulgence with which they were always viewed. Young men of various denominations or views were united in the School, and in no instance, we believe, was there the

least reserve or distrust in the expression of opinion, whatever it might be, or to whatever it might seem to tend. In truth, there were no limitations to the spirit of inquiry, and no restraints to the fullest utterance of thought, except those prescribed by the laws of decorum, and those which every reflecting mind will prescribe to itself under the law of reverence.

Happy must be esteemed the seminary that enjoyed so long the services of such an instructer. "Nearly all the ministers of the country, of one of the principal Christian denominations, have been his pupils," by whom his memory is associated with every sentiment of grateful respect; while "of the whole number of young men that have been educated in the academical department of the University in the two centuries and more since its institution, nearly two fifths have been graduated since he was engaged in its service." And when we consider the susceptibility to religious impression, which, with all that may be admitted of its frivolity, is still natural to the youthful age, and reflect how salutary must be the influence of such a mind, it would be difficult to estimate the amount of good he has rendered, the numbers he has trained to virtue, or the benefit, which, through the influence of their example, he may yet confer on multitudes who may never have known him. It was to transmit and perpetuate an influence like this, that it was commanded to the chosen people, "to make known what was told to the fathers unto the children, that so the generation to come might know it, even the children that should be born, who should arise and declare it unto their children."

Dr. Ware died on the 12th of July, 1845, in the eighty-second year of his age. His last years were years of infirmity. To the usual lot of old age was added the calamity of the loss of sight, which he sustained with the same unshaken trust and calm submission to God, with which he had met all the trials of life. He was deeply sensible to the blessings which had fallen to his lot, alike to those that could only be remembered and to those that still remained. "It is not possible," says he in a journal quoted in the Discourse, "for me to express sufficiently my gratitude to God for the prosperity he has given me;" and after an enumeration of other favors, in which the modesty

as well as moderation of his spirit is exhibited, he particularly adverts to his "sources of domestic satisfaction and peace, in the character, dispositions, conduct, and affections of all the nearest relations of life, unalloyed by a single exception of unamiableness of character, personal defect or misfortune."* It was the will, however, of the Maker of his frame, that his last months should be months of intellectual as well as physical decay. And did we not reflect, that life itself is but "a circumstance of being," we should be ready to number it among the mysteries of divine Providence, that a mind so constantly active and a judgment so invariably sound should be left to unconsciousness. But his friends were consoled by the recollection of his faithful use of all his gifts through the long period they were lent him; and they had been too well instructed by his own example, to regret unduly a temporary darkness, that was so soon to be followed by a cloudless and eternal day.

Of the contemporaries of Dr. Ware, honored among the lights and ornaments of their time, there are, doubtless, some who were more distinguished than was he by the splendor of their genius, by profound or varied learning, and by the gift of a persuasive eloquence. But for the qualities, which, combining intellectual with moral power, are most beneficial in their influence and most worthy of imitation,— reverence with patient investigation of truth, soundness with impartiality of judgment, courage and independence in the maintenance of his own opinions with the most considerate respect for the opinions and motives of others, wise views of life with earnest improvement of its opportunities, unshrinking fidelity to duty, and unhesitating submission to God from faith in the rectitude of his will, — who is there that has left a more instructive example, and for whom may we be assured of a brighter reward? F. P.

* The following passage from Dr. Palfrey's Discourse presents so engaging a picture of Dr. Ware's peculiar domestic happiness, that we cannot forego the satisfaction of transcribing it here.

"On the 20th of August 1835, in his seventy-second year, circumstances favored the gathering of all his race around his table, and they assembled, to the number of fifty, all his living children by birth and by the adoption of marriage, and all his grandchildren, to overjoy his heart, and take his blessing together, and grasp each other and both their revered parents in fraternal and filial embraces. What a group! What centres of influence, what objects of wide love and veneration, were met that day, from their several spheres, beneath that roof."—p. 35.

ART. IX. — PLATO AGAINST THE ATHEISTS.*

As an indication of the increasing taste for the study of the Platonic philosophy, we regard the present edition of the Tenth Book of the famous Dialogues on Law with great interest. There is no writer of ancient, or, possibly, of modern times, who will better repay an attentive perusal, than the broad-shouldered son of Ariston. He has an almost inexhaustible mine of the richest thought; but this is not his greatest excellence. He is the most suggestive of all the writers of antiquity. Discoursing as he does upon those subjects which interest the human mind most deeply, he leads the careful student to independent investigation: — a result in the highest degree desirable. It is this power — more striking in him, than in others who have treated upon the same, or kindred topics — that always characterizes the truly great writer. A few at the present day possess it. In English literature Carlyle is prëeminent for it: although his style is barbarous in the extreme and worthy of the severest censure. France may well be proud of the venerable La Mennais, who unites this excellence with a lofty, pure, and elegant diction, that discovers at the same time deep erudition, severe scholarship and transcendent genius. These two great men stand almost alone, at the present time, in their respective countries. They however compare with Plato in scarcely anything else: — Carlyle less than the gray-haired Frenchman, since he touches questions less akin to those dwelt upon by the Greek philosopher; who, although living in an age remote from Christianity, insisted, with all the argument and eloquent persuasion of a powerful intellect and intense morality, upon many of those immortal truths which the Christian now folds to his heart in hope and love.

The genuineness of the twelve Dialogues on Law, of which this book forms a part, has indeed been questioned:

---

* *Plato contra Atheos. Plato against the Atheists; or, the Tenth Book of the Dialogue on Laws, accompanied with critical Notes, and followed by extended Dissertations on some of the main Points of the Platonic Philosophy and Theology, especially as compared with the Holy Scriptures.* By TAYLER LEWIS, L. L. D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in the University of New York. New York. 1845. 12mo. pp. 378.

but no reasonable doubt will arise in the mind of one conversant with the other works which are universally attributed to the same great author. The style and manner of reasoning are the same; and if Plato wrote the "Politicus," the "Republic," or the "Timæus," he wrote the "Laws" also. The editor of the present work founds an argument for the genuineness of the "Laws" upon its resemblance to the "Parmenides." He should have recollected — for surely he must know — that the "Parmenides" itself has been, and still is, the subject of much critical controversy; and though he might succeed in showing the resemblance of the "Laws" to it, he would not have established the claims of either. Setting resemblances aside, however, we may safely assert that if the "Laws" — a work equal in power of thought and execution with the "Republic," — had been the production of any other man, his name would have been handed down to us; for he must have possessed a mind not only similar, but equal in originality, keenness and depth with that of the author of the "Republic" and the "Philebus," and would have had equal claims to our regard and admiration.

Plato is generally and justly lauded by his admirers for the logic, beauty, and sublimity, which he displays when discoursing either of the human soul and its immortality, or of the Divine soul and its eternity. This work, chosen by the editor "as one of the best central positions from whence to make excursions over a large part of the Platonic philosophy," possesses a very great degree of conclusive reasoning, and much of the philosopher's accustomed beauty and power of illustration.

With regard to the title which the editor has seen fit to affix to his book we must take exception; for it cannot, correctly speaking, be entitled "Plato against the Atheists," inasmuch as the arguments and penal laws which follow, are not directed against the Atheists alone. Plato treats of three classes of offenders: — first, Atheists; secondly, Theists, who deny a Providence; and thirdly, those who acknowledge the existence and presiding providence of the gods, while they deny their immutability, and believe that they can be propitiated by the prayers and sacrifices of the wicked. Now Atheism, or a disbelief in the existence of God, or the gods, is one thing; and Theism, or a belief in

the existence of the Deity, although at the same time embracing a denial of his immediate and superintending providence, is quite another. Still farther removed from Atheism is the belief in the efficacy of individual sacrifice and prayer in averting the merited punishments of Heaven. Had the book been entitled "Plato against the Heretics," the title might have been less inaccurate.

The Greek text, — which, together with the critical notes upon it, occupies only eighty-three out of three hundred and seventy-eight pages, — conforms to that of Bekker and Ast, whose editions vary slightly from that of Ficinus Florentinus; and for clearness and beauty is worthy of all commendation as a specimen of typographical neatness and editorial care. It is to be hoped that other editors of the Greek classics will take this edition as a provocative to "good works," if not entirely for a model.

We propose to glance at the spirit and design of this Tenth Book of Laws, and see what they are, and what Plato intended they should be.

The *dramatis personæ* are Clinias, a native of Crete, Megillus, the Spartan, and an Athenian traveller, who meets them near Cnossa, a town of Crete. This traveller, who carries on the philosophical part of the colloquy, is termed by the editor "the Socrates of the dialogue." From internal evidence it appears that Plato had himself in view: for once forgetting the extreme delicacy of his self-hiding modesty, which almost invariably leads him to make his great master the principal person of the debate.

The Dialogue on Laws has already advanced through nine books, and this is the first of the concluding three, opening with a strong recognition of the right of property; the violation of which Plato asserts to lie at the foundation of all immediate personal injuries, to the consideration of which the preceding book has been devoted. In addition to the wrongs committed against society having their rise in a thirst for the enjoyment of wealth, regardless of the mode of getting it, and the consequent violation of the right of property, Plato takes note of those wrongs, also, which spring from the mere turbulence and disregard of restraint, and insolent and impious bearing, of "the young men." These latter wrongs he divides into six classes; viz.: — first, irreligious levity and mockery of the sacred

rites which were performed in the public places of the tribes, or wards of the city: — second, the same conduct with regard to private devotions or household gods, and the robbery and desecration of tombs, on which, as was the case among the rich families of Athens, great wealth was expended in costly ornaments and tasteful decorations: — third, and distinct from the preceding two, was the disregard of parental authority and insolent behavior at home: — fourth, seizing and carrying away, in despite of the magistrates, their badges or instruments of office: — fifth, the prosecution of any citizen without good reason, or from mere motives of malice: and sixth, and last, impious speech or action, or blasphemy of the gods. This last class of crimes he divides into three, and then subdivides each of the three species of this class into two others — making this last class of offences the genus of six separate species. It is with this genus and its subdivisions that the Tenth Book is occupied.*

The three classes of offenders and their distinguishing beliefs are thus introduced at the second page. "Let this be understood," says the Athenian guest, "that no one believing in the deities according to the law will ever do an impious deed or speak an unlawful word. But he that does is liable to one of these three charges; — either that he does not believe in the existence of the gods; or, he believes that, although they exist, they do not exert a

* In his statement of the argument, Dr. Lewis has omitted fully to mention this logical arrangement of the six primary divisions of the wrongs — ὕβρεισ — and turbulence — ἀχολασία — of which young men, more than others, were supposed to be guilty. He notices, however, the three greater and three minor divisions which Plato makes of this same sixth class of the crimes and criminals treated of in the work, and we should be led to suppose that he merely overlooked so small a matter in his haste to give an outline of the main body of the Dialogue, were it not for an unlucky note on the second page; where, in a critical remark on the plural of ὕβρισ, he enumerates five, only, of the six classes. Now it so happens that, in the text, Plato himself enumerates only five, prefixing to each its appropriate number; and when he comes to the sixth, he omits its number, as it is the last, and, from its being the subject of the whole book, the most important of them all. Still Plato does not leave anything to be guessed at by his readers, but immediately on finishing the fifth class makes the remark, that he should now attend to the consideration of the crime and punishment of those who despise the gods: which remark is, in fact, the real beginning of the work; the mention of other crimes being merely introductory. This however does not excuse carelessness in a scholar of any pretensions, and the editor should have examined the course of the argument more thoroughly.

watchful care over mankind; or, thirdly, that they can be propitiated when approached with sacrifices and prayers."* Immediately after follow the arguments against the belief of the three classes respectively; commencing with Atheism, or a belief that the gods do not exist.

It must be kept in view, that Plato, according to his assertions in the very outset, considers atheism to be a kind of disease incidental to the young men, which would be outgrown as years and experience advanced. In view of this he admonishes the young man, that his opinions will materially change as he grows older; that he will not be the first whose views have been altered in regard to this matter; but that many before him have held opinions as atheistical as his own, yet, almost universally, "did not continue from youth to old age to hold that there are no gods." This is rather unsatisfactory food for a doubting, hungry mind. At any rate a goodly proportion of modern readers would think it so, whatever nourishing fitness it may have had for the intellectual stomach of Athenian atheism; which had already failed to be convinced by the order and harmony of nature, "the earth and sun and all the stars, and the seasons so pleasantly varied each month and year;" and furthermore, indeed, saw no convincing significance in the prayers and adorations of both Greeks and barbarians, when all, at morn or even, knelt to the rising and the setting sun, "or moon of paler ray." But Plato by no means leaves the matter with this admonition. He is about proposing a law against the atheist, and wishes to establish beforehand that atheism is unwarranted by reason. In the argument he fully establishes what he sets out to prove, namely, the existence of some first and original Cause. Passing by the order and beauty of the universe, and the argument of Socrates from fitness and benevolence, which is so much insisted on by the school of Paley and Butler, he launches out, at once, into the ether of abstract reasoning, and shows, by a conclusive argument from *motion*, that a primal *mover* must necessarily exist.

The popular belief in Athens at the time of Plato was, that the earth was fixed immovably in space, and that the

* Opp. ed. Ficin. p. 364.

heavenly bodies revolved around it. Everything upon the earth not animated was inert, and, if moved, was moved by some extraneous force. Matter had no power of self-locomotion. The bodies of the animate creation were material, but they were moved by the spirit of life within them. Man walked upon the earth: his soul originated and continued the motion of his material body. The butterfly, sweet emblem of immortality, spread its rich and delicate wings on the summer air, or lifted them with palpitating motion to the warm sunlight while resting on flower or marble sepulchre: its little spirit was the motive power. The volcano sent forth its flames and flaming lava, and trembled to its base: some incarcerated giant was wrestling with the bars of his subterranean prison. The streams danced on in joyfulness, singing to the rocks through which they flowed: naiads and sylphs were there invisibly urging them on, and making melody with their own sweet voices to beguile the gentle toil. The sea rose upward to the sky in billowy majesty, or flung itself with loud hurrahs upon the echoing shore: Neptune was riding abroad in his shell-chariot, with trident and crown and flowing beard of snow. Matter had no self-motion: spirit moved the whole. The planets pursued their courses in the heavens, moving on from year to year: deities they were; or else, if not, were at least the bodies of deities, who, robed in fire, ruled their respective spheres. Spirit was in the heavens above, to move, as in the earth below. Spirit was the universal cause of motion. But some denied this, and refused, and perhaps derided religious homage; saying, that the sun and the stars were material, that earthquakes were — earthquakes, and fire — simple fire, and nothing more. The state was built up on the theogony: — the theogony derided or denied, the state trembled. The atheist was the enemy of society.

The popular mind had no arguments at hand to combat the denial of the gods; because it believed in their existence on false or frivolous grounds. The premises on which it relied being denied as absurd or fanciful, conclusions drawn from them were powerless. Thus the "disease" of atheism readily infected the younger and less submissive of the citizens, whom neither interest nor fear of authority deterred from independence of thought, or freedom and

turbulence of speech and action. It was Plato's intention to counteract this malady by two powerful medicines — argument and force: — the first, to convince the honest, thoughtful doubter; the second, to awe the vicious and the headstrong: — and thus to preserve his ideal state from the danger which at all times threatened his native city.

Plato saw the fallacies on which the popular belief rested; and in this argument for the existence of the gods has demonstrated all that can be demonstrated without a divine revelation. Passing by, for the time, any argument drawn from the regularity of the motion of the celestial bodies, he at once seizes the idea of *motion in the abstract*; and in the following argument, slightly paraphrased and condensed from the original, attacks with singular success the cavils of the atheist.

'Let us grant,' virtually says the Athenian to the atheist, 'that the sun, moon, and stars are neither gods, nor the bodies of gods, but mere inert and lifeless matter, as you assert. You will of course admit that they *move*; for to this all men will testify. You will admit also that all motion is produced in two ways: first, by a power self-acting, like the movements of men and other animals; secondly, by a power *not* self-acting, like the movement produced by one stone being thrust against another, so that the stone before at rest is moved out of its place, or the movement of an arrow flying from the bow. But all self-acting power resides only in the animal kingdom, where life, or spirit is. The motion of the heavenly bodies cannot be self-acting, for you have just asserted, and we admitted, that the planets were neither spirit nor body of spirit, but merely lifeless, inert matter. Therefore their motion must belong to the second class, namely, motion not self-acting, but communicated by some extraneous power, by which these bodies are forced along in their celestial courses. Now this extraneous power is either self-acting, or it is not. If it is not self-acting, then it is the product, immediately or remotely, of some other power which is self-acting. But self-acting powers may be separated into two grand divisions. First, or inferior, are those which, although self-motive and capable of moving others, are at the same time acted on or moved by some other power: second, or superior, are those self-acting or self-moving powers which are

not, and cannot by their nature be, acted on or moved by others, but move, or act on, others at pleasure. But we have said that all self-moving powers have life; therefore this second or superior class of powers are alive. *These are the superior gods.*'

The existence of living deities whose presence could not be perceived by the human eye was indeed the common, yet vague belief, and had been for ages, but it was first fully demonstrated by Plato. After this, the beauty, order, and regularity of the universe evinced to the minds of his disciples the wisdom and intellectual greatness of the gods who formed and ruled it. The atheist might now assert that the sun was merely matter or flame, and the stars but drops of fire, and still not shake the religious belief of Plato's disciples, for they had a reason for their belief which no such assertion, however plausible or true, could move or undermine. Still the atheist might be regarded as an enemy of society at large, which was not thus enlightened.

The belief in spirit existing independent of body was now vivified and strengthened, so that what was before a mere fancy became, in the minds of those who understood the new philosophy, real and tangible. If spirit might thus live independent of bodily form, then could the spirit of man also live after its body had returned to the dust whence it came. Here was the argument for the future life of the human soul flowing, directly, from the proof of the existence of the gods.

It has been oftentimes asserted by admirers of Plato, who have pretended to understand him, that in his reasonings he arrived not only at the existence of divine beings, the gods of the ancients, but also, at the Hebrew idea of the one God. This is wholly unwarranted; for Plato neither believed nor asserted anything of the kind. His was pre-eminently a metaphysical and logical mind, although a poetical and imaginative one; and of logic and metaphysics he never lost sight, although he often did of poetry. When he uses the terms, "the deity," "the best," "the highest," "the all," he does so to express the *genus*, or kind, of which all spirits are the species. Thus the spirit of a beast, the spirit of an insect, and the spirit of a man are species belonging to the same genus, (to wit, *soul*,) as

the inferior and superior gods. A knowledge of this will materially assist the student in reconciling the apparent contradictions with which he meets in Plato's works, when "the deity," or "over-soul," is spoken of.

That this is not a hastily formed, or groundless opinion, as far, at any rate, as the Tenth Book of the Laws is concerned, will be readily seen by a reference to Plato's own words.

"*Athenian.* Ought we not to affirm, necessarily, that *soul*, which dwells in and governs all things that are moved, also dwells in and governs heaven?

Clinias. Most certainly.

Ath. Is it one, or many? Many — if you will permit me to answer for you — for we ought not to recognise less than two; one benevolent, and the other the contrary.

Clin. You have spoken most correctly." *

Another quotation on this point will perhaps suffice; although others of the same tenor might be easily adduced.

"*Ath.* Now therefore it will be easy to affirm distinctly, as a necessary conclusion, since *soul* leads round all the planets in their orbits, that either it is the best soul or its contrary, which attends to and directs this circular motion.

Clin. O guest! after what has been said it would not be ingenuous to say that any other than *soul*, whether one or many, having all excellence, thus gives orbitual motion to all the planets.

Ath. You perfectly understand my thought, O Clinias; but you must supply, still farther, something which is wanting.

Clin. What is it?

Ath. Have not the sun, and moon, and the other planets, *each* a soul, if soul really gives this circular motion?

Clin. What would hinder?

Ath. Let us then frame our reasonings touching *one soul*, so that they may appear adapted to all the heavenly natures.

Clin. The soul of which?

Ath. Of the sun every man may see the body, but no one the soul: neither the soul of any other body, nor of animals, whether living or dead. But there are many grounds for believing that this *genus*, by its nature so wholly incapable of being perceived by us through any of the bodily senses, is yet capable of being known."†

---

* Page 31.—Opp. ed. Ficin. p. 669. † Page 36.—Ficin. p. 669.

Having finished discoursing on the first kind of false belief, the Dialogue proceeds with a consideration of the second form of irreligion noticed at the commencement; namely, that the gods take no care of men or notice of their actions, and, therefore that the good receive no reward, and the bad no punishment at their hands. This, Plato suggests, may arise from beholding the prosperity of the wicked, and seeing them rise to wealth and power through the most flagrant means, and at last, dying full of honors in an advanced old age; their children, and grandchildren after them inheriting their riches and places of power. By several illustrations — such as the physician, the general, and naval commander, who attend, in the management of the trusts committed to them, not only to the greater, but, also, to the minor details of their professions — he shows, by analogy, that the gods keep a watchful care over everything in the universe, whether great or small, and would be considered culpable if they did not: for sometimes "even the smallest stone is necessary in a building to the firmness of the largest one," and the most minute action may have the greatest influence upon the ultimate welfare of, not only a man's whole life, but of the whole universe. "You forget," says Plato* to the "young man," "that everything is made for the benefit of the whole, in order that the existence of the whole may be happy: and that all things are not created for you, but you for all;" and that every individual of the human race is subject to the same law. This doctrine of the connexion of the individual with the whole, and that he is created for the benefit of the universe, has become a favorite idea. Yet that any man can be said, strictly speaking, to be created merely for an appendage to the whole, is not extremely clear; since the whole is but an aggregation of individuals.

In this argument against those who denied that the gods rewarded men according to their works, the doctrine of future punishment is distinctly and impressively asserted. Guilt may prosper in this life, but will receive its deserts in the next. "He that is evil, shall depart to the souls that are evil; and he that is good, to such as are good. As in life, so shall it be in death; like shall be joined to like, in both work and recompense."† What Plato believed, and

* Page 58. — Ficin. p. 671. † Page 62. — Ficin. p. 672.

taught as the deduction of his own reason, our Saviour revealed to the world as truths which his Father and our Father had sent him into the world to teach to the sons of men. The conclusions at which a careful and honest reason arrives are seldom, if ever, wrong. How great, then, are the powers which a kind and all-wise God has given to us poor creatures of a day!

The third part of the argument, directed against the belief that the gods might be propitiated and appeased by the supplications and sacrifices of the wicked, is introduced by the Athenian's asking his fellow-traveller and their venerable host "what officers, to compare small things with great, were like the gods?" Whether naval commanders, or generals at the head of armies were like them? Or whether charioteers contending in the stadium, or physicians whose care is of diseases, were like the gods? Or whether they could be compared to husbandmen carefully watching the crops in the season of rains, or to those who lead a pastoral life, attending flocks and herds; or to watch-dogs guarding the tent or fold? All of whom might be corrupted by gifts and bribes to betray the interests which they were appointed to guard. If the gods could thus be moved by the prayers and gifts of unjust men, then were they partakers of wickedness and guilty of great wrong. But the attribute of justice is essential to the idea of an upright *man*. The gods are greater and better than an upright man: therefore they cannot be unjust, nor capable of being moved by the prayers and sacrifices of unjust men. From this argument it appears that Plato considered the gods to be inexorable in their judgment of mankind.

Having finished the three divisions of his argument, Plato concludes with instituting the punishments due to each class of unbelievers according to the degree of their criminality. And, in the first place, he would have three prisons erected in a city for all kinds of criminals: — one, a very large receiving prison, to be situated conveniently near the Forum; another, as a House of Correction, to be situated near the chief rendezvous of the "night-police;" and the third, in the least frequented and most lonely part of the city, to be denominated the "Prison of punishment;" answering very nearly to the modern state-prison.

The Atheists, he goes on to divide into two classes: one

of which openly derided the established worship and sneered at all religion. This class of offenders he holds to be worthy of death. But the second class, who were careful not to sneer at or deride religious duties, but avoided scoffers and loved rather to consort with the good and pious, he held should receive only warning and imprisonment: whether for life, or not, he does not say.

Those who denied the watchful care and providence of the gods, he also divides into two classes. The first, of inoffensive manners, whom he would confine in the house of correction for a period not less than five years; during which time no person should be allowed to visit or speak with them, except the members of the night-police, whose duty it would be, in such cases, to converse with the prisoners on matters pertaining to the welfare of their souls. If again found guilty of the same crime, persons of this class were to be punished with death. This was also the punishment of the second division of these deniers of Divine providence; who, in addition to their dangerous belief, led turbulent and vicious lives.

He likewise divided those believing in the efficacy of prayers and bribes to appease the offended gods, into two classes: the first, of inoffensive life, to be imprisoned, like those denying Divine providence; the second, together with necromancers and wizards who pretended to power over demons, and those who took money and gifts for interceding with the gods to stay the vengeance which would otherwise fall upon the heads of the guilty, — a singular allusion to an abuse, whose parallel is intimately interwoven with the history of the Romish Church,—to be imprisoned for life, and constantly kept in irons, in the "prison of punishment," and fed only by the menials of the prison, no free-born person being ever allowed to visit them. When one of these prisoners died, his body was to be cast beyond the limits of the city, without burial; and if any free-born person should bury the body, he should be liable to the like punishment, whenever any one could be found willing to testify against him. If the prisoner had children, for whom the city could find employment, they were to be declared orphans, and, as such, delivered to the proper officers on the same day that the prisoner was condemned.

In addition to these penal enactments, the book closes

with an ordinance providing for the public worship of the gods, in the temples, where the legal priests and priestesses should receive offerings and conduct the ceremonies in a pure and holy manner. With this is given a prohibition of all private sacrifice, and nearly all private worship of whatever kind or description. It would not seem, from this, that Plato had a very exalted notion of the rights of conscience and freedom of speech, so much insisted on at the present day: but it clearly indicates, that the loftiest moral and religious teacher is not, necessarily, also the best lawgiver. A division of intellectual, as well as physical, labor is demanded, if it is wished to secure to society the conservation and advancement of its vital interests. The union of church and state, except in a pure theocracy, like that of the Hebrews, is never, and from the nature of things never can be, beneficial to society. It is one thing to elevate and refine the morality of the world by the persuasion of argument, and another to perform the same thing by the strong arm of legislation. The history of mankind appears to show, that while the former has built up institutions which time can neither render obsolete nor the insane spirit of radicalism destroy, the latter has left no abiding impress upon the hearts of men, and scarcely anything but faint and fading traces of its momentary power. Appeals to the individual are more effectual and permanent than legal enactments, which bear only upon society as a mass; for, declaim as earnestly and eloquently as we will, it is as true of society as of individuals, that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" since every permanent law is but the expression of the heart of a people, and is only vivid and salutary when it thus originates. Elevate and refine individual morality, and in the process of time, slowly but surely, elevation and refinement will develop themselves upon the face of society; while those who think to reform the world by a sudden and spasmodic effort, err most lamentably. The seed must be suffered to remain in the soil and germinate beneath the soft influence of rain and warming sun, throughout the spring-time, before the summer can see the tender blade, or the autumn return to us the rich, bending ear of the golden harvest. The moral teacher in like manner must wait patiently for the springing and final maturity of the princi-

ples which he sows in the bosom of society, and should not grow peevish and distrustful because he cannot at once see the fruit of his labors.

Legal interference with religious opinion has always been productive of serious injury to the cause of true religion, and it seems strange to us that the editor of this work, living as he does in an age when the history of the world is so plainly read and in a country whose institutions are wisely at war with bigotry, should feel and think so narrowly that he can seek to infuse the spirit of intolerance into the minds of the young; for whom, he tells us in his preface, this edition is especially intended. There are many forms of irreligion which work incalculable mischief in society, undermining and overthrowing the very pillars that support it. Atheism, if suffered to pursue its legitimate and oftentimes avowed ends, would render all this fair world a desert, and spread over it a pall of gloom on which one could not look without a cold and deathly shudder; dead bodies and yawning graves would be overhung by a sunless, starless firmament, and every leaf and bending flower would drip with a chill dew of blood. Intolerance, however, is no antidote for this terrible pestilence. Has this disease fastened upon a man, intolerance will only aggravate the symptoms and render his recovery desperate. The sick should not be treated harshly, but with kindness. They should not be shunned, and warned by the loud and harsh voice of selfish prudence not to approach our dwellings. And above all things, for sweet pity's sake, let us forbear to teach our children to mock and deride and hate them.

Of the many valuable and interesting hints which the editor has given us in the extended "*excursus*" appended to the text, we have no time, at present, to speak as we would like; and this is of less consequence, as they have, for the most part, but very little to do with the elucidation of this work, although much to do, with the elucidation of Plato's general system of philosophy.* We will conclude by merely saying, that while we recognize the scholarlike

* We had intended to point out the error into which the editor has fallen with regard to the Platonic use of the words *εἶδος* and *λόγος*; no venial error, one would think, in a scholar of sufficient love of the great Athenian to induce the writing of above three hundred pages of notes, besides the editing of the text.

care with which this edition is abundantly marked, and while we praise its editor for his exertions in bringing to the public eye this portion of Plato's works in so desirable a form, we must kindly but severely warn both him and others, that the spirit he has shown a desire to foster in the young is one unworthy of a man, and should be foreign to a Christian. R. H. B.

ART. X. — PRISONS AND PRISON DISCIPLINE.*

IT is with a feeling of deference that we welcome Miss Dix's Remarks on Prisons and Prison Discipline. Her peculiar and exalted labors in the cause of humanity, her renunciation of the refined repose that has such attractions for her sex, and which was her lot, to go about doing good, enduring the vicissitudes of our changeful climate, the hardships of travel, and, more trying still, the coldness of the world, have awakened towards her a sense of gratitude,

---

* 1. *Remarks on Prisons and Prison Discipline in the United States.* By D. L. DIX. Second Edition. Philadelphia. 1845. 8vo. pp. 108.

2. *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* Boston. 1844. 8vo. pp. 116.

3. *Prisons and Prisoners.* By JOSEPH ADSHEAD. With Illustrations. London. 1845. 8vo. pp. 320.

4. *Report of the Surveyor General of Prisons on the Construction, Ventilation and Details of the Pentonville Prison.* London. 1844. fol. pp. 30.

5. *Revue Penitentiaire et des Institutions Préventivès,* sous la direction de M. MOREAU-CHRISTOPHE. Tom. II. Paris. 1845. 8vo. pp. 659.

6. *Du Projet de Loi sur la Réforme des Prisons.* Par M. LEON FAUCHER, Paris. 1844. 8vo.

7. *Considerations sur la Réclusion Individuelle des Détenus.* Par W. H. SURINGAR. Traduit du Hollandais sur la seconde edition. Précedés d'une préface, et suivrés du Résumé de la question Pénitentiaire. Par L. M. MOREAU-CHRISTOPHE. Paris et Amsterdam. 1843. 8vo. pp. 131.

8. *Nordamerikas Sittliche Sustande.* (The Moral Condition of North America.) Von Dr. N. S. JULIUS. 2 Vols. Leipzig. 1839. 8vo.

9. *Archiv des Criminalrechts, herausgegeben* von den Professoren ABEGG, BIRNBAUM, HEFFTER, MITTERMAIER, WACHTER, ZACHARIA. (Archives of Criminal law, edited by Professors etc.) Halle. 1843. 12mo. pp 597.

and invested her name with an interest which cannot fail to attach to anything from her pen.

The chosen and almost exclusive sphere of woman's influence is at home, in the warmth of the family hearth. It is but rarely that she is able to mingle with effect in the active labors, which influence mankind. We read with incredulity of the feminine expounder of the Roman law, who illustrated by her lectures the Universities of Padua and Bologna; and the charities of St. Elizabeth of Hungary seem legendary in the dim distance; though, in our own day, the classical productions of the widow of Wyttenbach, crowned a Doctor of Philosophy by the University of Marsburg, and most especially the beautiful labors of Mrs. Fry, only recently closed by death, are high examples of the potent influence which may be exerted by the gentler sex, even beyond the charmed circle of domestic life. Among these examples Miss Dix will receive a place which her modesty would forbid her to claim. Her name will be enrolled among the benefactors of her age. It will be pronounced with gratitude, when the heroes in the ignoble strifes of politics and of war shall be disregarded or forgotten.

> "Can we forget the generous few,
> Who, touched with human woe, redressive sought
> Into the horrors of the gloomy jail,
> Unpitied and unheard, where misery moans,
> Where sickness pines?"

Miss Dix's labors embrace the penitentiaries, jails, almshouses, poor-houses and asylums for the Insane, throughout the Northern and Middle States; all of which she has visited, turning always a face of gentleness even towards crime, in the hope of comforting the unfortunate, of softening their hard lot, of sweetening their bitter cup, while she obtained such information with regard to their condition, as might, when properly represented, draw towards them the attention of the public. This labor of love she has pursued earnestly, devotedly, sparing neither time nor strength, neglecting no person, however abject or lowly, frequenting the cells of all, and by word and deed seeking to strengthen their hearts. The melody of her voice still sounds in our ears, as she read in the long corridor of the Philadelphia Penitentiary a Psalm of consolation; nor will

that scene be quickly effaced from the memory of any who were then present. Her Memorials, addressed to the Legislatures of different States, have divulged a mass of facts, derived from her personal and most minute observation, particularly with regard to the treatment of the Insane, which were remarkably calculated to arouse the sensibilities of a humane people. She is in herself alone a whole Prison Discipline Society. To her various efforts may be applied, without suspicion of exaggeration, those magical words in which Burke has commemorated the kindred charity of Howard, when he says that he travelled "not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, nor the stateliness of temples; not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, nor to form a scale of the curiosities of modern art; not to collect medals, nor to collate manuscripts; but to dive into the depths of dungeons, to plunge into the infection of hospitals, to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain; to take the guage and dimensions of misery, depression and contempt; to remember the forgotten; to attend to the neglected; to visit the forsaken, and to compare and to collate the distresses of men."

Her "Remarks" contain some of the general results of her observations on different points connected with the discipline of Prisons; as, on the duration of sentences; pardons and the pardoning power; diet of prisoners; water; clothing; ventilation; heat; health; visitor's fees; dimensions of lodging cells in the State penitentiaries; moral, religious and general instruction in prisons; reformation of prisoners; the Penitentiary systems of the United States; and Houses of Refuge for Juvenile Offenders. It would be interesting and instructive to examine carefully the conclusions on all these important topics, which have the sanction of her disinterested experience; but our limits will restrain us, on the present occasion, to a single topic.

We are anxious to take advantage of the interest which Miss Dix's publication may excite, and also of the authority of her name, to say a few words on a question which has been much agitated, and is the subject of many books, — the comparative merits of what are called the Pennsylvania and Auburn Penitentiary systems. This question is, perhaps, the most important of all that grow out of Prisons;

for it affects, in a measure, all others. It involves the construction of the prison, and its administration.*

The subject of Prison Discipline, and particularly the question between the two systems, has occupied of late years a large share of the attention of jurists and philanthropists. They have been discussed in all the languages of Europe, to such an extent that the titles alone of the works relating to them would occupy a considerable space in a volume of Bibliography. We have before us, for instance, a list of no less than eleven works in Italian. To Howard, a man of true greatness, whose name will stand high on the roll of the world's benefactors, belongs the signal honor of first awakening the sympathies of the English people in this great work of benevolence. By his travels and labors, he became familiar with the actual character of prisons, and was enabled to spread before the public an accumulation of details, which fill the reader with horror and disgust. Before his day, scarcely a single ray of humanity had penetrated the dreary confines of an English prison. Idleness, debauchery, disease, blasphemy, squalor, wretchedness, brutality, mingled as in a hateful sty. All the unfortunate children of crime, the hardened felon, whose soul was blurred by repeated guilt, and the youthful victim, who had just yielded to temptation, but whose countenance still mantled with the blush of virtue and whose soul had not lost all its original brightness, without any separation or classification, were crowded together, in one promiscuous, fermenting mass of wickedness, with scanty food and raiment, with few or no means of cleanliness, the miserable prey of the contagion of disease and the worse contagion of vice and sin. The abject social degradation of the ancient Britons, in the picture drawn by Julius Cæsar, excites our wonder to a less degree, than the well-authenticated misery of the poor prisoners in the polite annals of George III.

Of all the circumstances which conspired to produce this misery, it cannot be doubted that the promiscuous commingling of the prisoners, in one animal herd, was the most

* Beyond the constant practical interest which it offers, there is a special one at the present moment, in the circumstance that the citizens of Boston are about to erect a new jail, the plan of which is still undetermined.

to be deplored. While this continued, all hope of reform was vain. It was, therefore, with especial warmth, that Howard pleaded for the *separation* of prisoners, especially at night, "wishing to have so many small rooms or cabins, that each criminal may sleep alone;" * and called attention to the fact that in Holland, "in most of the prisons for criminals there are so many rooms, that each prisoner is kept separate."†

The importance of the principle of separation had been first recognized at Rome, as long ago as 1703, by Clement XI., in the foundation of the hospital of St. Michael, or the House of Refuge, where separate dormitories were provided for each prisoner. Over the portal of this asylum, in letters of gold, were inscribed the words of wisdom which Howard adopted as the motto of his labors, and which indicate the spirit that should preside over the administration of all prisons:—*Parum est improbos coercere pœna, nisi probos efficias disciplina:*—It is of small consequence to restrain the wicked by punishment, unless you render them good by discipline. The first and most important step in this discipline is, to remove the prisoners from all evil influences; which can only be done by separation from each other, and by filling their time with labor.

In furtherance of this principle, and that he might reduce it to practice, as early as 1779, Howard, in conjunction with Sir William Blackstone, drew an Act of Parliament, in the preamble of which is an enunciation of the cardinal truth, which lies at the foundation of all effective prison discipline.

"Whereas," says the Act, "if many offenders convicted of crimes for which transportation has been usually inflicted, *were ordered to solitary imprisonment, accompanied by well-regulated labor and religious instruction,* it might be the means under Providence, not only of deterring others from the commission of crimes, *but also of reforming the individuals,*" etc. Noble words! Here for the first time in English legislation the reformation of the prisoner is proposed as a distinct object. This Act, though passed, was unfortunately never carried into execution, through the perverseness, it is said, of one of the persons

* Howard on Prisons, p. 22. † Ibid. p. 45.

who was associated with Howard, as a Commissioner for erecting a suitable prison.

As early as 1790, a law was passed in Pennsylvania, which is of importance in the history of this subject, showing an appreciation of the principle of seclusion with labor. In the preamble it is declared, that the previous laws for the punishment of criminals had failed of success, "from the *communication* with each other not being sufficiently restrained within the places of confinement, and it is hoped *that the addition of unremitted solitude to laborious employment*, as far as it can be effected, will contribute as much to reform as to deter;" and the Act further provides that certain persons "*shall be kept separate and apart from each other*, as much as the convenience of the building will admit." As late as 1821, another Act was passed in Pennsylvania, providing "for the erection of a Penitentiary for the *separate confinement of the convicts at labor*." In pursuance of this Act the Penitentiary was built at Philadelphia, which afforded the first example on an extended scale of the application of the principle of the absolute separation of the convicts from each other, combined with labor. And this Penitentiary has given its name to the class of prisons, which are founded on this principle. In Europe the state of Pennsylvania is hardly more known for her shameful neglect to pay the interest of her public debt, than for her admired system of Prison Discipline.

It should be borne in mind, that this system is distinguishable from one of *solitary* confinement with labor; much more, from one of mere solitary confinement without labor. An intemperate opponent, who has been too rash or too prejudiced to recognize all the truth, has often characterized it as *the Solitary system*, and by this term not unfrequently aroused a feeling against it, which must disappear before a candid inquiry. The soul shrinks with horror from the cell of perpetual solitude, as repugnant to the unceasing yearnings of the nature of man. The terrors of the Bastile, whether revealed in the pictured page of Victor Hugo or in the grave description of dungeons where toads and rats had made their home, contain nothing which fills us with such dread, as the unbroken solitude which was the lot of many of its miserable victims. We have the testimony of Lafayette, whose own further expe-

rience at Olmutz should not be neglected, as to its effect. "I repaired to the scene," he says, "on the second day of the demolition, and found that all the prisoners had been deranged by their solitary confinement, except one. He had been a prisoner twenty-five years, and was led forth during the height of the tumultuous riot of the people, whilst engaged in tearing down the building. He looked around with amazement, for he had seen nobody for that space of time, and before night he was so much affected, that be became a confirmed maniac." The woful experience of these unfortunates was revived in the prisoners at Spielberg, and Silvio Pellico has left a record of sufferings, in the perpetual solitude of his cell, which he vainly sought to relieve by crying out to the iron bars of his window, to the hills in the distance, and to the birds that sported in freedom in the air.

Such a system is an engine of cruelty and tyranny, excluding every rational idea of improvement or reformation. It is kindred to the iron boot, the thumb-screw, the iron glove, and other terrible instruments of a vengeance-loving government. It hardens, abases, or overthrows the intellect and character. Such a punishment is justly rejected in a Christian age, which has learned to consider the reformation of the offender among its essential aims.

Names often have the importance of things; and it cannot be doubted that the ignorant or dishonest application of the term *solitary* to the system pursued in Pennsylvania, is a strong reason for the opposition which it has encountered.

The *Separate* system has but one essential condition; the absolute separation of the prisoners from intercourse of any kind with each other. On this may be ingrafted labor, instruction, and even constant society with the officers of the prison, or with virtuous persons. In fact, these have become, in a greater or less degree, component parts of the system. In constant employment the prisoner finds peace; and in the society with which he is indulged, an innocent relaxation and a healthy influence. This is the Pennsylvania system.

Another and rival system, first established in the "Maison de Force" at Ghent, but borrowing its name from the Auburn Penitentiary of New York, where it was first introduced

in 1816, by a remarkable disciplinarian, Elam Lynds, has occupied much attention. Under this the prisoners are separated only at night, each sleeping in a small cell or dormitory by himself. During the day they labor together in shops, or in the open air, according to the nature of the work, being prohibited from speaking to each other, under pain of punishment. From the latter feature this is often called the *Silent* system. As its main peculiarity, in contradistinction to the *Separate* system, is the working of the prisoners in assemblies, where all may see and be seen, it may be more proper to designate it as the *Congregate* system.

Such, in brief, are these two systems, which, it will be observed on careful attention, both aim at the same object, the separation of the prisoners from all intercourse with each other. In the one, this end is attained by the physical separation of all during night and day; in the other, by such a separation at night, and an untiring watch by day to prevent intercourse. Of course, the separation by the Congregate system is less complete than by the other. Conversation by words may be restrained; though it is now admitted, that no guardian is sufficiently wakeful to intercept on all occasions those winged messengers. But the extensive unwritten language of signs, the expression of the human countenance, the movements of the body, may telegraph from convict to convict thoughts of stubbornness, hatred or revenge.

If separation be desirable, should it not be complete? Should not the conducting links between the prisoners be broken, so that no electrical spark may propagate its disturbing force? But the very pains which are taken in the Congregate system to guard silence by day and separation by night, seem to answer this question. Thus, by a strange inconsistency, the advocates of the *Congregate* system seek to enforce *separation.* Though wedded to an imperfect practice, they yet recognise the correct principle.

But before proceeding further with this comparison of the two systems, let us call attention to what are the real objects of prison discipline, that we may be better enabled to determine which is best calculated to answer these objects.

There are three purposes which are proposed by every

enlightened system. First, by the mode of restraint of convicts, to deter others from crime. Second, by their restraint, to prevent them from again preying upon society. Third, by discipline and care, so far as is possible, to reform the offender. There are strong grounds to believe that the first two purposes are best attained by the Separate system; but without considering these particularly, let us pass to the vital question, which is best calculated to perform that truly heavenly function of reforming the criminal.

Is not the answer prompt and decisive, in favor of that system which most completely protects the convict from the pernicious influence of his brethren in guilt? It is a venerable proverb, that a man is known by the company he keeps; and this is a homely expression of the truth, that the character of a man is naturally in harmony with those about him. If the society by which he is surrounded is virtuous, his own virtues will be confirmed and expanded. On the other hand, if it be wicked, then will the demon of his nature be aroused in this unholy fellowship. The bad qualities are quickened and strengthened, as well as the good, under the influence of society. Every association of convicts must, therefore, in a greater or less degree pervert, but never reform those of which it is composed. The obdurate offender, with a mind perpetually brooding on evil, will impart something of his own hardness of heart, even though he utter no audible word, to the congregation to which he belongs.

> "Dedit hanc contagio labem,
> Et dabit in plures; sicut grex totus in agris
> Unius scabie cadit, et porrigine porci;
> *Uvaque conspecta livorem ducit ab uva.*"

From the inherent nature of things this contagion must be propagated by the Congregate system; while the Separate system does all that man can do to restrain it. By the latter, as it has been successfully administered in various prisons, the convict is, in the first place, withdrawn, so far as is possible by human means, from all bad influences; while he is, in the second place, brought under the operation of good influences. Under such circumstances the mind is naturally diverted from the thick-coming schemes of crime, and turned to thoughts of virtue. What in it is

bad, if not entirely subdued, is weakened by inactivity, while the good is invited to constant exercise.

It cannot be questioned, then, on grounds of reasoning, independent of experience, that the Separate system is better calculated to promote that great object of Prison Discipline — the reformation of the offender. With this recommendation alone it would be entitled to the regard of all, who feel that the return of a single sinner is blessed in the sight of God.

But a further object is secured by this system. The convicts never being allowed to see one another, leave the Penitentiary, at the expiration of their term of punishment, literally unknowing and unknown, so far as their companions in guilt are concerned. And the delightful incident is mentioned, in illustration of this fact, that the keeper of the Philadelphia Penitentiary once recognized three persons, engaged in honest labor in the same place, who had been in his custody as convicts, though neither of them knew the career of the others. The discharged prisoners are thus enabled to slide back into the general mass of the community, without the chilling fear of untimely recognition by those with whom they had congregated in the Penitentiary. They cannot, indeed, escape the memory of the punishment they have endured; but the brand is not upon their forehead. They may be encouraged to honest exertion, in the hope of retrieving in a distant spot, and under a new name, the fair character which they have lost; while, on the other hand, if evil-minded, they will have no associations of the prison to renew, or to stimulate into conspiracies against society.

A system of Prison Discipline with these benign features must long ago have commended itself to universal acceptance, if it had not been opposed with peculiar ardor on grounds, which, though in reality untenable, are calculated to exercise a strong influence over the ignorance and prejudices of men.

The first objection was, that it is productive of insanity, on account of an unnatural deprivation of society. However just this may be when directed against the Solitary system, it is totally inapplicable to what is called the Separate system, which does not exclude the idea of society, and, as practically administered at Philadelphia and else-

where, supplies labor and society in ample measure to all the convicts. If the prisoner is not indulged with society enough, it is a fault in the administration of the system, and not in the system. Elaborate tables have been presented, in the publications of the Boston Prison Discipline Society, seeking to shew a tendency to insanity in the Penitentiary at Philadelphia; but a careful and candid inquiry will demonstrate that these have been founded in misapprehension, and will exonerate that admirable institution from this suspicion. The highest authorities in medicine have distinctly declared that the Separate system, if properly administered, with labor and conversation with the keepers of the Penitentiary, does not affect the reason of the prisoners. The names of Esquirol and Louis give to this opinion the strongest sanction of science throughout the civilized world. The same conclusion has been affirmed with precision and fervor by Lélut in an elaborate memoir, which is now before us, to the Institute of France; and also by the scientific Congress assembled at Padua in 1843, and at Lucca in 1844.

The second objection charged the Separate system with being unfriendly to the health of the prisoners; as compared with the Congregate system. In reply to this we will merely say, that the great names in medicine, to which we have already referred, expressly deny that this system has any influence in shortening life; while a comparison of the statistics of several Penitentiaries which are conducted on the Congregate system, with those of the Philadelphia Penitentiary, shows the superiority of the latter in this respect.

The third and last objection was founded on the increased expense of the Separate system. The other was recommended by the suggestions of economy and the clamors of cupidity. It was said that it is put into operation at less cost, and afterwards not only supports itself, but brings a profit (listen to the chink of gold and silver!) to the State. We are sorry to believe that this consideration has had an extensive influence on the reception of the the better system throughout our country. It is humiliating, to suppose that any government would hesitate to adopt a system founded on an enlightened humanity, because another might be had for less money; counting the unworthy gain, or the petty economy, as of higher conse-

quence than the reformation of an offender. Such a course is unworthy of the civilization of this age. The State has sacred duties towards the unfortunate men whom it takes into its custody. It must not only see that they receive no harm, but that they enjoy all the means of improvement consistent with their condition; that, while their bodies are clothed and fed, their souls and minds be not left naked and hungry. It assumes the place of a parent, and owes a parent's care and kindness; or rather, when we consider that the State itself is the child of the people, may we not say, that it should emulate the filial piety, which descended into the darkness of a Roman dungeon, to afford its exuberant, health-giving bosom to the exhausted being from which it drew its life.

But it is not only on these general grounds that we recommend the Separate system. Notwithstanding the uncompromising hostility which it has encountered, it has won constant favor. Many prisons have been built on this plan, and experience now comes to confirm the suggestions of humanity and science. The Penitentiary at Philadelphia, which gives its name to the system, was followed in 1833 by one at Pittsburgh, and by a County Prison at Alleghany, in Pennsylvania; and in 1841, by another County Prison, on the same system, at Harrisburg. In 1834 New Jersey followed the example of her neighbor State, and established a Penitentiary on this system at Trenton.

Various Commissions from foreign governments, after visiting the different prisons of the United States, have all reported *emphatically* in favor of the Separate system; as that of Beaumont and De Tocqueville, to the French Government, in 1831; of Mr. Crawford, to the English, in 1834; of Dr. Julius, to the Prussian Government, in 1835, after a most careful perambulation of all the prisons of the country; of Demetz and Blouet, to the French Government, in 1835, — being the second Commission from the same Government; and of Neilson and Mondolet, to the Canadian Government, in 1836.

In accordance with these recommendations numerous prisons have been built or are building in Europe. In England, a model prison has been constructed at Pentonville, which is, perhaps, the best prison in the world. In

the late Report of the Surveyor General of Prisons, which was laid on the table of Parliament during its last session, it was expressly declared from the experience gained in the Pentonville Prison, "that the separation of one prisoner from another is indispensable as the basis of any sound system." As long ago as 1843, no less than seventeen prisons were built or building in different counties of England, and several in Scotland, on this principle. In France the whole subject has gone through a most thorough discussion by the press, and also in debate by the Chamber of Deputies. Among the works now before us is a volume of more than six hundred pages, which is filled by a report (with notes) of this debate, which ended in the passage of a law during the last summer, appropriating ninety millions of francs for the building of thirty prisons on the Separate system. Such is the testimony of France and England.

Similar testimony comes from other quarters; — from Prussia, where five prisons on this system have been built; from Denmark, where ten are now building; from Sweden, where eight are now building, under the auspices of the monarch, who, when Prince Oscar, wrote ably in advocacy of the Separate system; from Norway, where one is now building in the neighborhood of Christiana; from Poland, where one has long been in existence, and three others are about to be completed; from Hungary, where a project has been submitted to the Diet for the erection of ten on the Separate system; from Holland, where one is about to be erected on the plan of that of Pentonville; from Belgium, which has yielded to the Separate system, and has ingrafted it even upon the famous *Maison de Force* at Ghent, which afforded the model to our Auburn Prison; from the Duchy of Nassau; from the Grand Duchy of Baden; from Frankfort-on-the-Maine; from Hamburgh; from Geneva in Switzerland; in all of which there are prisons on this system either built or building. From poor, distracted Spain also proceeds the same testimony.

To this array of authorities and examples may be added two names of commanding weight in all matters of Prison Discipline, Edward Livingston and Miss Dix. The first, whose high fortune it was to refine jurisprudence by his philanthropy, as he had illumined it by his genius and

strengthened it by his learning, in his Introductory Report to the Code of Prison Discipline, as long ago as 1827, urged with classical eloquence a system of "seclusion, accompanied by moral, religious, and scientific instruction and useful manual labor." Miss Dix, after an attentive survey of different systems throughout our country, enforces with fervor, as well in the publication now before us as in her Memorials, the merits of the Separate system, and of its administration in Pennsylvania.

It might be said that the voices of all the civilized nations, by a rare harmony, concurred in sanctioning the Separate system, if the Boston Prison Discipline Society had not raised a most persevering note of discord, which has gone on with a most unmusical *crescendo*. As the solitary champion of an imperfect system which the world is renouncing, it has contended with an earnestness, which has often become prejudice, and with an insensibility to the real facts that were accumulating, which was injustice. It is with frankness, as it is with sorrow, that we allude to the sinister influence which it has exercised of late years over this question, particularly throughout the Northern States. But the truth which has been proclaimed abroad need not be delicately minced at home. We do not join with the recent English writer, who, among many harsher suggestions, speaks of the "misrepresentation," "the trickery," "the imposture"* of the Society or its agent; nor with Moreau-Christophe, who says, "La Société des prisons à Boston a juré haine à mort au systeme de Philadelphie;"† for we know well the honesty and sincere interest in the welfare of convicts which animate its Secretary, and we feel persuaded that he will gladly abandon the deadly war which he has waged against the Separate system, when he shall see it in the light in which it is now regarded by the science and humanity of the civilized world. But we feel that his exertions, which in some departments of Prison Discipline have been productive of incalculable good, for which his memory will be blessed, yet on this important question have done much harm. In his Reports he has never failed to present all the evil that had been said of the Separate system, particularly as administered in

* Adshead. p. 129. † Revue Pénitentiaire. Tom. II. p. 589.

Philadelphia, sometimes even drawing upon his imagination for his facts, while he has carefully withheld the testimony in its favor. This truly beneficent system, and its meritorious supporters, have been held up to obloquy, and the wide circle who confided implicitly in his Reports, consigned to a state of darkness with regard to its true character and its general reception abroad.

One of the most strenuous advocates of the Separate system at the present moment, whose work of elaborate argument and details is now before us, is Suringar, who has been called the Howard of Holland, and who had signalized himself by a previous opposition to it. He says, "I am now completely emancipated from my former error. This error I do not blush to confess openly. The same change has been wrought in the opinions of Julius in Prussia, of Crawford in England, of Bérenger and Demetz in France, and of all men of good faith, who are moved, in their researches, only by the suggestions of conscience, unswayed by prejudice or pride of opinion." Perhaps in these changes of opinion the Secretary of the Boston Prison Discipline Society may find an example, which he will not be unwilling to follow; and it may be reserved to us to welcome him as a cordial fellow-laborer in the conscientious support of what he has for a long period most conscientiously attacked.

From this rapid survey, it will be seen that our convictions and sympathies earnestly sustain the Separate system. To us, there is no axiom in Prison Discipline more stringent, than the duty of removing prisoners from the corrupting influences of association, even though in silence. But we are not insensible to the encouragement and succor, which prisoners might derive, in the march of improvement, from companionship with those who are struggling like themselves. It was a wise remark of the English Professor, "that students are the best professors to each other;" and the experience of Mrs. Farnum, the matron of the Female Convicts at Sing-Sing, whom we cannot name without a tribute of admiration, shows that this same principle is not without its effect even among classes of convicts. Perhaps the Separate system might be modified, so as to admit of instruction and labor together, in a small class, who may be selected after a probationary period of separation, as

worthy of this indulgence and confidence. Such a modification was contemplated and recommended by Mr. Livingston, and it would seem to find favor with Von Raumer in his recent work on America. This privilege can only be imparted to those who have shown themselves so exemplary in character and conduct, that their society will cease to be contaminating. But it remains to be seen, whether there is any subtle alchemy, by which their purity may be determined, so as to justify a departure from the general rule of separation.

Finally, we would commend this subject to the attention of all. In the language of Sir Michael Foster, a judge of eminence, "No rank or condition of life, no uprightness of heart, no prudence or circumspection of conduct, should teach any man to conclude that he may not one day be deeply interested in these researches." Thus there are considerations of self-interest, which may move those who do not incline to labor for others, except for some ultimate advantage to themselves. But all who confess a true benevolence, and a just appreciation of the duties of the State, will join in efforts for the benefit of the poor prisoner, deriving from his abject condition new motives to action, that it may be true of the State, as of law, that "the very least feels its care, as the greatest is not exempt from its power." In the progress of an enlightened Prison Discipline, it may be hoped, that our Penitentiaries will become in reality, if not in name, Houses of Reformation, and that the convicts will be treated with a scrupulous and extreme regard, alike to their physical, moral and intellectual well-being, to the end, that when they are allowed again to mingle with society, they may feel the precious sympathy with virtue and the detestation of vice, and that, though sadder, they may be better men.

In the promotion of this cause, the city of Boston at this moment occupies a position of signal advantage. It has determined to erect a new County Jail, the plans of which are still under consideration. It is easy to perceive that the plan which it shall adopt, and the system of discipline which it shall recognise, will become an example throughout the country. We trust that no narrow prejudice, and no unworthy economy will prevent the example from being such as becomes a city, of the wealth, refinement

and humanity of Boston. It is a common boast, that her schools and various institutions of beneficence are the best in the world. Let the prison about to be erected share this boast. *Let it be the best in the world.* Let it be a model prison, not only to our own country, but to other countries. The rule of separation, which we have considered of such importance among the ripe convicts in the Penitentiary, will be of greater necessity still in a prison which will receive, before their trial, both the innocent and the guilty. Each prisoner, from the first moment he is touched by the hand of the law, should be cut off from all association, whether by word or sight, with his fellow-prisoners. The State, mindful of his weakness, as his temporary guardian, owes him this protection against temptation, and this means of reformation.

The *absolute separation* of all prisoners, so that they can neither see, hear nor touch each other, is the pole-star of Prison Discipline. It is the Alpha, or beginning, as the reformation of the offender is the Omega, or the end. It is this principle, when properly administered, which irradiates with heavenly light even the darkness of the dungeon, driving far away the intrusive legion of unclean thoughts, and introducing in their vacant place the purity of religion, the teachings of virtue, the solace of society, and the comfort of hope. In this spirit let us build our prisons. The jail shall no longer be a charnel-house of living men; the cell shall cease to be the tomb, wherein is buried, what is more precious than the body, a human soul. From their iron gates let us erase that doom of despair,

Leave all hope behind, who enter here;

and inscribe other words of gentleness, of encouragement, of hope. C. S.

NOTE TO ARTICLE IV.

SINCE this article was printed, and just as our number was closing, another book has been announced as in the press, which would have come within the range of our remarks. It is called the "Service Book for the Church of

the Saviour; with a Collection of Psalms and Hymns." A particular notice of it would further illustrate some of the points, on which we have been led to speak. But for this we have no room. Its ritual part contains greater variety than we have seen in any preceding work of the kind. There are fifteen short Services for morning or evening worship; and to the Selections from the Psalms are added Selections from other portions of the Scriptures. These last are gathered as they could be found suitable, without reference to their original connexions, and arranged so as to be read responsively. An increasing tendency thus seems to be shown in our denomination towards written forms of conducting the devotions of the church. The Hymns are but another edition of Dr. Greenwood's, with a supplement of 116 new pieces. We are not sure that the greater part of these additional hymns would have been our own choice; but that is a matter, on which we do not feel ourselves called to enlarge. The compiler is Rev. R. C. Waterston, pastor of the "Church of the Saviour," whose name will go far to recommend his preferences. We heartily wish, that the church which is now building for the use of his society, and into which this Collection is to be introduced, may be carried up strong and beautiful to its top-stone, and entered prosperously, and consecrated to a long blessing, in due time.

May we be allowed, in closing, to say a single word of a lighter character? We have spoken of this church as now "building." We do not say, that it is "in course of construction," or "in progress of erection," or "in process of completion," or "being built." This is because we are content with our paternal English tongue. If any should ask us *what* it is building, we shall, like Queen Elizabeth on another occasion, "leave them answerless." N. L. F.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Introductory Lectures on Modern History, delivered in the Lent Term, 1842; ***with the Inaugural Lecture, delivered in December,*** 1841. By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Head Master of Rugby School. Edited from the Second London Edition, with a Preface and Notes, by HENRY REED, A. M., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. New York. 1845. 12mo. pp. 428.

DR. ARNOLD'S reputation as a classical scholar was established in an eminent degree by his edition of Thucydides, accompanied by critical notes and disquisitions in the English language; and this reputation has been confirmed and enlarged by that portion of his "History of Rome," which he lived to complete. These writings, together with those which have appeared since his death, exhibit proofs not only of remarkable scholarship in ancient learning, but of a mind richly stored with various knowledge, and endowed with a combination of rare and high qualities.

The volume before us consists of eight Lectures introductory to an extended course which he proposed to deliver on Modern History. The author defines history to be "the biography of a society." He adds, "it does not appear to me to be history at all, but simply biography, unless it finds in the persons who are its subject something of a common purpose, the accomplishment of which is the object of their life. History is to the common life of many, what biography is to the life of an individual." Upon this idea he builds the scheme of his lectures, and unfolds the relations and traces the progress of society by examples, drawn from the conduct of men as marked by the principles of human nature, and exhibited under the various forms of political and social bodies. This is done in a manner perfectly simple and direct, without any parade of novel theories, or any of those vagaries of abstraction and speculation, which, by a false use of language, have been called the philosophy of history. With a lively imagination, and quick powers of thought, Dr. Arnold's mind was eminently practical; his style is flowing, animated, and energetic, sometimes ornate, always perspicuous; his illustrations are numerous and well applied. His remarks on the methods of studying history, the knowledge requisite for that study, and the objects to be attained by it, are peculiarly interesting and valuable. By way of explaining his views, he touches at considerable length on some of the prominent events of modern European history;

showing throughout an independent spirit, untrammelled by prejudices or local predilections, a heart open to generous impulses, and a mind elevated and enlightened by an expansive toleration. These qualities are conspicuous in the lectures on the questions relating to the Church in England, and on the condition of that country after the Revolution. The intricate question of the credibility of history is ably examined in a lecture on that subject.

Professor Reed's notes constitute a valuable addition to the original work. Many of them are selected from Dr. Arnold's other writings, in which he explains more at large some of the opinions advanced in the Lectures. Occasionally likewise the editor enters with learning and ability into original discussions, with the view of illustrating the author's positions. S.

Grammar of the Chaldee Language, as contained in the Bible and Targums. By Dr. George B. Winer, Professor of Theology, etc. in the University of Leipsic. Translated from the German, by H. B. Hackett, Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. Andover. 1845. 8vo. pp. 152.

A person tolerably well acquainted with Hebrew is prepared for an easy acquisition of the related dialects. The Chaldee alphabet is the same as the Hebrew; the vocabulary is so to a considerable extent, aud the grammatical forms have the same general character; so that the student, with no great pains, may proceed from his reading of the rest of the Old Testament to those chapters in Daniel and Ezra which are written in Chaldee, and thence, if his curiosity takes such a direction, to a perusal of the Chaldee *Targums* or versions of the Hebrew books. Syriac is so like Chaldee, that some Grammars present the forms of the two side by side. It is almost the same language in a different alphabetical character; and a second step, still easier than the first, enables the student to read a version of the New Testament which takes rank of all others in respect to merit as well as time, and which has the peculiar attraction of presenting the discourses of our Lord and his Apostles in substantially the same dialect as that in which they were originally uttered. Thus furnished, the student's further progress is exceedingly easy to the Samaritan, which opens the knowledge of another ancient version, and to the Talmudical and Rabbinical dialects, of which the whole basis is Chaldee. If he proposes to form some acquaintance with the Arabic translations, a more serious task is presented, but still one which his previous labors will have materially lightened.

Professor Hackett translates from Winer's Grammar published in 1842, a work greatly extended from his first edition of nearly twenty years before. We cannot say we like it the better for that. In its primitive state, it was, in our judgment, a very dull and repulsive specimen of German book-making. There is no mystery about these languages. In every particular, except the *lexicographical* difficulty attaching to words which occur but seldom, they are very easily mastered. It is the exceeding heaviness and cumbrousness of the grammatical apparatus furnished to learners, which makes them so awful. Professor Stuart, who studies a subject while he writes upon it for the public, kept on condensing his Hebrew Grammar edition after edition, and each compression was a material improvement, and a great deal more compression would still enhance its value. With good tables of the Chaldee forms, and fifteen or twenty pages at most, of explanation of the principal differences between them and the Hebrew, a student of fair intelligence, and with a good knowledge of the latter tongue, would, we think, read well the Biblical Chaldee, in about half the time that would be required for a careful perusal of Dr. Winer's Grammar. And he would have had very agreeable and useful, instead of very odious and unprofitable employment. Of the making of books there is absolutely no end, if writers set out to inflict all their manuscript collections and all their tediousness upon the reader. But grown men are not best served by any books, certainly not by Grammars, upon that model.

Still, for a person who has no taste but for Chaldee, nor any other occupation for his life, the study of Winer's Grammar, in so faithful a manner as to become possessed of all the exceptions, and verify them by an examination of all the references, and glance at all the books therein cited, and strike the balance between the opposite opinions of erudite critics on the various weighty matters therein mooted, will furnish interesting employment, which will hold out to his fullest wish and his latest day. At all events the zeal for Oriental literature, which has carried Professor Hackett through the work of such a translation, is highly creditable; and this patient, scholarly enthusiasm, together with the knowledge which he has acquired in the process, and which he exhibits in its result, is an agreeable earnest that he will engage the attention of his pupils, and ensure their proficiency, in this important class of studies. It is not for us to advise; but we heartily wish, that, accomplished as he has now made and shown himself in this department of knowledge, and able to select from the heap what a learner wishes to know, he would turn his attention to the composition of a Manual of his own, within a much smaller compass.

The Broken Vow, and other Poems. By AMANDA M. EDMOND. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. 1845. 12mo. pp. 324.

A Chaunt of Life, and other Poems, with Sketches and Essays. By Rev. RALPH HOYT. *In six parts.* Parts I. and II. New York. 1845. 8vo. pp. 32, each.

MRS. EDMOND has put forth a volume in which "Rodolpho, or the Broken Vow" is the longest, and we are tempted to say the poorest, production. Many of the other pieces have a devotional character, and are apparently inspired by a sincere spirit of piety, always pure, though at times somewhat despondent and gloomy. This world, with all its brightness and beauty, needs not to be constantly brought into a disparaging comparison with another and a better, for which, rightly used and enjoyed, it is a fitting prelude. We wish for our authoress a temperament more uniformly happy, that she may henceforth look out upon a brighter sky, not seeking too anxiously for clouds in the distant horizon. To her own modest concession, that in her work "critical severity may find much to condemn," let us not add one ungracious word: it is high and just praise for her, that virtue, purity and piety will find in it no cause for reproach.

The "Chaunt of Life" is an unfinished work, promising six cantos, but as yet producing only two. These two, however, afford favorable augury for those which are to come: it is to be hoped that embarrassments, alluded to in the advertisement of the publishers, may not prevent the completion of the poem. The phases of life which have been presented in the cantos before us are of a sombre hue, saddened with the recollections of departed friends and hopes that lie buried in their graves. There is a touching melancholy about these stanzas, not altogether healthful, yet perhaps none the less affecting because somewhat exaggerated. The reader will find the "Chaunt" sad and sweet, yet vigorous and manly. Should the cantos yet unpublished display to us life's brighter phases, we shall readily forgive the deepened shadowings of those now before us; at any rate, we pay to Mr. Hoyt the compliment of interested expectation. The shorter poems of these volumes are generally above mediocrity, two or three of them are excellent. The "Snow" is a peculiarly good piece of word-painting, as simple and beautiful as the subject which it depicts; the "World for Sale" is sprightly and sarcastic, but not bitter; "Old" is plaintive and melodious; "New" suggestive and truthful: all these pieces are worthy to be called *poems*, and deserve a grateful welcome. The "Sketches and Essays" exist as yet only in the promise of the title-pages. D.

Biographical and Critical Miscellanies. By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT, Author of "The History of Ferdinand and Isabella," "The Conquest of Mexico," etc. New York. 1845. 8vo. pp. 634.

Critical and Miscellaneous Essays. To which are added a few Poems. By ALEXANDER H. EVERETT. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 12mo. pp. 563.

Both these volumes have the same purpose, and both will be recommended by the literary reputation of their authors. They are meant to preserve in a permanent form the contributions which each has made to the periodical literature of his country. A part of the interest which attaches to such papers on their first appearance must necessarily cease with the lapse of time; yet there is a peculiar pleasure in recurring, after a writer has established a wide and sure reputation, to his earlier or more ephemeral productions. The contents of Mr. Prescott's volume were, with a single exception, originally furnished to the North American Review. Having been prepared with more than the usual care bestowed, at least in this country, on such writing, they particularly deserve to be presented in a form in which they will meet many eyes that might never have seen them in their primitive condition. The typographical character of the volume is worthy of notice.

Mr. Everett's volume contains, we believe, only the smaller portion of the articles with which he has enriched our critical literature. The public, we suppose, are less familiar with his name as a poet than as a writer of prose. We are glad, however, to meet the productions of his muse in companionship with his miscellaneous essays. The volume will be welcomed by the public as embodying some of the choicest pages of our literary journals, and we hope that the writer may be induced soon to give us one or more additional volumes.

Physical Education and the Preservation of Health. By JOHN C. WARREN, M. D., Professor of Anatomy and Surgery in Harvard University. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1846. 18mo. pp. 90.

THIS republication of a Lecture delivered by Dr. Warren before the American Institute in 1830, with an addition of nearly as much new matter, should be gratefully received by those for whom it is particularly designed,—persons of sedentary habits, of either sex. The name of the author will be sufficient to inspire confidence in his opinions, and in this little treatise he has given the result of much observation as well as scientific knowledge, in a course of plain, practical, and highly valuable remarks. G.

A Universal Pronouncing Gazetteer: containing topographical, statistical, and other information, of all the more important places in the known world, from the most recent and authentic sources. With a Map. By Thomas Baldwin, assisted by several other gentlemen. Philadelphia. 1845. 8vo. pp. 550.

This is a good book in two ways. It was much wanted, and it is exceedingly well done. One need not be much of a student, in order to have frequent occasion for such a work; and the best read scholars, whether in Geography or Philology, will not be those least likely to avail themselves of its references. The principles on which it is constructed recommend themselves to us as sound and judicious. Great pains have evidently been taken, in collecting and verifying its multifarious contents. The plan of it is in some respects quite new, requiring to be carried out with a wide search and at the same time with the minutest accuracy. Both the diligence and the care, we think, have been bestowed. The most exact information has been sought from the best authorities, native and foreign, whether books or living men. The result has been a mass of instruction, various but unconfused; for some portions of which we should have to inquire in several directions, and for others might be at a loss where to apply. Its preparation must have cost some years of diversified and delicate labor. Doubtless, some inadvertencies may be discovered in so miscellaneous a work; and since it is no larger, some omissions will be regretted. But on the whole, if we do not much mistake, it will prove an important help to the teachers of public and private schools; and all who are curious in this kind of learning, or ambitious of pronouncing strange names correctly, will give it a place upon some shelf that is not far from their sight and hand. F.

Easy Lessons on Reasoning. First American, from the second London Edition. Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 180.

Judging from our acquaintance with men in the common intercourse of life, and from the character of the multitude of speeches which in these days are perpetually inflicted upon the public on all sorts of subjects, we should say, that the department of education most neglected, though most important, is that which teaches the mind to reason justly and forcibly; and here is a book, which we can with a clear conscience recommend as one, the judicious use of which in our schools will help to supply the defect. It is ascribed, and on good grounds we should say, to Dr. Whately, author of the two well known treatises, "Elements of Logic," and "Elements of Rhetoric."

It may be said, in fact, to be the former treatise simplified in such a way as to render it adapted to a "course of elementary studies for young persons generally." This process of *simplifying* knowledge often leads to very superficial attainments. We do not think, that this objection lies against the present book, which certainly cannot be studied without quickening the powers of intellect and aiding in the acquisition of habits of discriminating thought, and precision in the use of language. L.

The Book of Peace: A Collection of Essays on War and Peace. Boston: George C. Beckwith. 1845. Small 8vo. pp. 490.

THIS volume is a collection of Peace tracts, very neatly printed, though on a type much smaller than we like to read. The object has been, to bring as much as possible of the soundest and best matter on this subject within the compass of a single, and not bulky volume. "The work," says the editor, "is truly *multum in parvo*, a thesaurus of information on Peace, containing a far greater amount of facts, statistics, and arguments on its various topics, than our own or any other language can furnish in thrice the compass." The compilation is made "from some of the best writers in the last three centuries, from men of every faith, Protestant and Catholic, Orthodox and Unitarian, Episcopal, Baptist, and Presbyterian." We commend the book to the attention of all who feel an interest or a curiosity respecting the great subject of which it treats. It is especially a suitable book to put into parish or town libraries. G.

Poetry for Home and School. Part Second. Selected by the AUTHOR of "Theory of Teaching," and "First Lessons in Grammar." Boston: S. G. Simpkins. 1846. 18mo. pp. 168.

THOSE who are familiar with the former "Part" of this work will not need to be urged to procure whatever farther collection of poetry may be made by one who has shown so much taste and judgment in her selections. Our only doubt concerning this little volume would be, whether it is suited for use in a "school." Many of the pieces require a considerable culture of the imaginative faculty, to enable them to be relished, or even properly understood. The longest in the book — Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" — it is our misfortune to like the least, having always had a disposition to substitute such unmannerly words as tedious and silly (we crave mercy for our dulness as well as rudeness) in place of the epithets used by its admirers. Most of the pieces, however, are better suited both in length and character, for school exercises. G.

The Library of American Biography. Conducted by JARED SPARKS. Second Series. Vol. VII. Boston. Little & Brown. 16mo. pp. 448.

THE object of this series, to which we have occasionally referred, is to record the lives and deeds of individuals who have been born, or have won their fame and distinguished themselves, on the Western Continent. Of course history, as well as biography, forms the contents of the volumes. By far the larger proportion of the individuals thus commemorated have here for the first time received the full and careful notice of the biographer. The present volume contains the lives of some individuals who well deserve the honors here accorded to them. Mr. Sparks, the faithful and laborious Editor of the series, furnishes the Life of John Ribault, the enterprising and devoted pioneer of the French settlements in North America, who was worthy of a better reward than he was permitted to enjoy. Rev. Dr. Francis contributes a Life of Father Rale, the famous Jesuit missionary to the Abnakis Indians, of whose zeal we speak in superlative terms when we say that it equalled the jealousy which our fathers entertained of it. Dr. Palfrey furnishes the Life of his grandfather, William Palfrey, eminent in the days preceding and attending the American Revolution, of the army of which he was Paymaster General — an excellent, an honorable and a useful man. G.

The Common School Algebra. By THOMAS SHERWIN, A. M., Principal of the English High School, Boston; Author of 'Elementary Treatise on Algebra.' Boston: Phillips and Sampson. 12mo. pp. 238.

A TREATISE on Algebra for the use of Common Schools, from the source from which this emanates, can hardly fail of meeting a favorable reception from the public. Besides an intimate acquaintance with the subject, Mr. Sherwin has the advantage of long experience in teaching, and knows precisely the difficulties encountered by the pupil, which he has taken some pains to lessen or obviate by a "series of introductory exercises." Through the whole he has aimed at simplifying the science as far as consistent with the main object, which is "not to save the learner the trouble of thinking and reasoning, but to teach him to think and reason," and "ensure a good knowledge of the subject." We think that he has succeeded. His method is clear, his language precise and simple, the connexion and dependence of the parts natural and obvious, and for the purpose for which it was intended he has made an excellent book. L.

The Unitarian Annual Register for the Year 1846. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 60.

The Housekeeper's Annual and Ladies' Register: for 1846. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 84.

THESE two works, though different in purpose and character, have a sufficiently obvious resemblance to account for our including them in the same notice. The Unitarian Register, for which we are indebted, as it appears from the initials affixed to the "advertisement," to Rev. Mr. Livermore of Keene, is projected on a very good plan, but, we think, bears marks of haste in the execution. Another year will give opportunity for a careful revision and a still more valuable selection of contents. The present number will be found both convenient and instructive, offering much information which before was within the reach of but few persons.

The Housekeeper's Register has been for many years an acquaintance and a favorite. This year it comes with its usual variety of pleasant and useful matter. The description of the months is particularly agreeable.

The Singer's Text Book; consisting of simple Rules and easy Music for Common Schools. By J. & H. BIRD. Second edition. Cambridge. 1845. 24mo. pp. 38.

WE had intended that our notice of this little book should contain some remarks of a friend, who pronounces its *method* excellent, — the design being to lead the young mind slowly and progressively to a practical knowledge of music, — but much of the poetry poorly selected, dull or insipid. He complains that most of the children taught in our schools learn to sing by rote and not by note, an evil which the use of this book would prevent. But we have only room for these few words.

The Bible and the Child. A Discourse. By JAMES MARTINEAU. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1845. 8vo. pp. 23.

Purity and Charity. A Discourse on behalf of the Children's Friend's Society, delivered in the First Baptist Church, Providence, October 7, 1845. By EDWARD B. HALL, Pastor of the First Congregational Church. Providence. 1845. 8vo. pp. 16.

The Duty of Moral Reflection with particular reference to the Texas Question. A Sermon, preached to the Third Congregational Society of Hingham, on Sunday, November 16, 1845. By Rev. OLIVER STEARNS, Pastor. Hingham. 1845. 18mo. pp. 20.

Home. A Thanksgiving Sermon, preached at King's Chapel. By GEORGE G. INGERSOLL. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

A Thanksgiving Discourse. By WILLIAM H. FURNESS. Nov. 27th, 1845. 8vo. pp. 20.

Peace—Not War. A Sermon preached in the Federal Street Meetinghouse, on Sunday, December 14, 1845. By EZRA S. GANNETT. Boston: J. Dowe. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

Remarks upon an Oration delivered by Charles Sumner before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4th, 1845. By a CITIZEN OF BOSTON. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 31.

An Address delivered in Ipswich, Mass., before the Essex Agricultural Society, at its twenty-fifth Annual Exhibition, Sept. 24, 1845. By EDWIN M. STONE. Salem. 1845. 8vo. pp. 44.

An Address delivered before the Massachusetts Charitable Mechanic Association, on its First Semi-centennial Anniversary and Thirteenth Triennial Festival, October 2, 1845. By FREDERIC W. LINCOLN, Jr. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 64.

An Address delivered before the Boston Mercantile Library Association, on the occasion of their Twenty-fifth Anniversary, October 15, 1845. By ROBERT C. WINTHROP. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 38.

A Poem. (before the same). By R. C. WATERSTON. 8vo. pp. 20.

Anniversary Address delivered before the American Institute of the City of New York, at the Broadway Tabernacle, October 17, 1845, *during the Eighteenth Annual Fair.* By the Hon. T. D. ELIOT, of New Bedford, Mass. New York. 1845. 8vo. pp. 19.

As a literary performance, Mr. Martineau's Discourse pleases us more than some of his other writings. It contains much important truth, beneath splendid but not turgid diction. In his general views of the unsuitableness of the Old Testament to the purposes of religious instruction for our young people we should agree, but from some of his remarks on particular portions of the ancient Scriptures we must express our entire dissent. — Mr. Hall, after presenting in a strong light, and setting free from objections, the paramount duties of purity and charity, —a purity which in its largest sense is piety, and a charity "built on Christian principle and Christian prudence,"—presses the claims of the institution for which he was preaching, judiciously and forcibly. — Mr. Stearns devotes most of his Sermon to an

exposition of the duty of "moral reflection," or of "thoughtfulness" concerning the relations in which we stand to other beings; from which at the close he deduces a course of earnest remarks on the part which the people should take, in opposing the admission into the Union of a territory doomed to increase "the enormous wrong" of Slavery. — Of Dr. Ingersoll's beautiful sermon on Home if we should say just what we think, those who have not seen it might impute to us the extravagance of panegyric. We will therefore only advise such to read it, and learn both how grateful they should be for home, and how they may make it the scene of their purest pleasures. — Mr. Furness's Thanksgiving sermon is written in his usual style of careful elegance, and presents a very impressive delineation of the blessings which we enjoy in our possession of "personal freedom;" while it closes with an allusion, which every one must feel to be in place, to the existence of slavery on our soil. — Mr. Gannett takes occasion from the present state of our relations with Great Britain, to insist on the unchristian character of war, and considers the grounds of insensibility to its true character among Christians.

Whatever judgment may be pronounced on some of the critical decisions of the writer of the Remarks on Mr. Sumner's Oration, the pamphlet contains a great deal of strong argument, and the ability with which it is written, and its easy, transparent style of pure, idiomatic English, none will deny. — Mr. Stone's Address before the Essex Agricultural Society, the first in the Commonwealth "to publish in detail its transactions," embodies many facts, suggestions and remarks, which will be found interesting and useful as well to the general reader as to the practical farmer, and its moral tone is of the healthiest kind. — Mr. Lincoln's semi-centennial Address, though it presents fewer historical notices than might seem desirable on such an occasion, yet shows a just appreciation of the dignity and usefulness of the mechanical professions, and encourages self-respect, manliness, integrity and generous and elevated aims in those engaged in them. — Mr. Winthrop's Address is marked by a broad range of thought and historical illustration, and contains an eloquent exposition of the influence of commerce, alike in its local and its "larger and more comprehensive relations," and especially in its antagonism to war. — The accompanying Poem by Mr. Waterston falls smoothly on the ear, breathes a delightful spirit, and judged by the ordinary standard of anniversary poetry has nothing to fear from criticism. — The connexion and dependence of the several branches of industry and enterprise, the rights of labor and the importance of scientific culture, are well set forth in Mr. Eliot's Anniversary Address, which is a fresh and animated performance.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — The King's Chapel congregation in this city have chosen a successor to the late Rev. Dr. Greenwood. Rev. Ephraim Peabody, being obliged to leave New Bedford by a regard to his health, has accepted an invitation to become their minister. According to the usages of this church the services of induction into office will be performed by the Wardens, and not by an ecclesiastical council. — Rev. Mr. Parker of West Roxbury has accepted an invitation from a new religious society in this city, now worshipping at the Melodeon, to become their minister, and will therefore close his connexion with his former congregation. — Rev. Mr. Perkins, in consequence of his state of health, has relinquished the charge of the pulpit at Cincinnati, Ohio; where for the present Rev. Dr. Thompson of Barre is preaching. — Rev. Mr. Brown has resigned the parochial charge at Brattleboro', Vt. — Rev. Mr. Fosdick has resigned his ministry at Sterling. — Rev. Mr. Barry has resigned the pastoral office at Framingham, and accepted an invitation from the new society at Lowell. — The connexion of Rev. Mr. Damon with the congregation at Templeton has been dissolved.

Several members of the class recently graduated at the Divinity School have received and accepted invitations from vacant churches. We shall record their Ordinations as they shall take place. — Rev. Mr. Harrington, late of Chicago, has accepted an invitation to become the minister of the new society in Hartford, Conn. — Rev. Mr. Woodward, late of Bedford, has accepted an invitation to preach at Galena, Ill., for a year. — Several engagements, as we learn, have been made for the supply of pulpits during the winter or for a longer period. Rev. Mr. Pierpont, late of Boston, is thus engaged at Troy, N. Y. — Rev. Mr. Angier of Milton, at Washington, D. C. — Rev. Mr. Sargent of Boston, at Somerville. — Rev. Mr. Gale of Scituate, at Norton. — Mr. G. W. Bartol, recently from the Divinity School, at Chicago, Ill. — Mr. John Ellis, also from the Divinity School, at Eastport, Me. — Rev. Mr. Capen of South Boston has taken charge of the ministry-at-large in Baltimore, Md., for the winter. — Rev. Mr. Wellington, late of Manchester, N. H., is preaching in the city of New York, with reference to the formation of a third Unitarian society.

New York Convention. — The Autumnal Unitarian Convention for 1845 was held in the city of New York, October 22, 23, and 24. Advantage was happily taken of the dedication of the meetinghouse recently erected by the First Unitarian congregation, to invite the attendance of those who sympathized with them in their faith and hope, and by a very convenient arrangement the exercises of the Dedication and the Convention were brought into connexion. The weather was favorable; the number of clergymen present, larger than the distance from most of their homes would have allowed us to ex-

pect; the attendance of others exceeded our anticipations, many of both sexes being present, and some participating, in the discussions of the Convention, while the public services were thronged; the spirit of the various meetings was excellent, freedom, cordiality and an earnest but natural seriousness distinguishing them; and the effect seemed to be what all rejoiced in perceiving and feeling. The Convention was organized on Tuesday evening, October 22, in "the church of the Messiah," where all its subsequent sessions were held. After being called to order by Rev. Dr. Dewey, a Committee of nomination was appointed, who reported the following list of officers, who were chosen: — Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D. of Boston, *President;* Rev. Orville Dewey, D. D. of New York, Rev. G. W. Burnap of Baltimore, Hon. Stephen Fairbanks of Boston, *Vice-Presidents;* Rev. Chandler Robbins of Boston, Rev. C. T. Brooks of Newport, *Secretaries;* Rev. George Putnam of Roxbury, Rev. S. K. Lothrop of Boston, Rev. Samuel Osgood of Providence, Seth Lowe Esq. of Brooklyn, G. A. Crocker Esq. of Taunton, *Committee of Business.* The President, on taking the chair, made a few remarks, respecting the design of the Convention, and announced the religious services of the evening. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Briggs of Plymouth, and a Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, from 1 Timothy i. 15, on the prominence which should be given, in our exhibitions of Christianity, to the fact of human sinfulness, and the advantage which we may derive from our views in presenting the Gospel as a provision for the sinner's wants.

On Wednesday morning the Convention met, by adjournment, at 9 o'clock. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester. After some incidental business, the Committee reported a series of resolutions, the first of which proposed a plan of organization for future semi-annual Conventions of our body, which gave rise to considerable debate, and was finally recommitted, to be presented in a new draught at a subsequent session. After prayer by Rev. Mr. Sewall of Scituate, the Convention adjourned, to attend the services of "Consecration."

The name of "the Church of the Divine Unity" had been given by the First Unitarian society in New York to the beautiful edifice which they have erected in place of the house, whose size and condition alike made them desirous of a more commodious building. Its situation, in the upper part of the principal street of the city, renders it more convenient for the worshippers, while the depth of the vestibule throws the church so far back from the street as to prevent any disturbance from the noise of that great thoroughfare. The interior of the building presents an example of highly elaborated Gothic architecture, and affords proof of the taste and liberality of the congregation. The Consecrating Prayer having been offered by Rev. Dr. Kendall of Plymouth, a Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York, from Ezra vi. 5 and 16, on the nature and importance of the Unitarian controversy, and the sectarian position which we held.

At 3 1-2 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon the members of the Convention, by invitation of the three Unitarian congregations of New York and Brooklyn, sat down to a Collation prepared in the Apollo Saloon, a hall capable of accommodating five or six hundred persons, which was filled by ladies and gentlemen, meeting as

amidst the blended associations of home and the sanctuary. Jonathan Goodhue Esq. of New York presided. The Divine blessing was asked by Rev. Mr. Lunt of Quincy. After the wants of the body had been supplied, brief addresses were made by several gentlemen. The company separated at 6 1-2 o'clock, after singing the doxology.

On Wednesday evening religious services were held in the church of the Divine Unity. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston, and a Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury, from John xviii. 37, on the sufficiency of the teachings of Jesus, as recorded in the Gospels.

The Convention reassembled on Thursday morning, at 9 o'clock. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Hall of Providence. The resolutions presented by the Business Committee, after the first, (which had been recommitted,) were severally considered. The second was in these terms, and after a few words from one or two members, was unanimously adopted: —

Resolved, That Unitarian Christianity being derived solely and wholly from the Scriptures, avoids alike the errors of hierarchical and traditionary faith and discipline on the one hand, and of the rationalistic theory on the other.

Elders Simonton and Currier, of the Christian denomination, and Rev. E. T. Taylor, of the Methodist Connexion, being present, were, by a unanimous vote, invited to take seats with the Convention; each of them afterwards participated in the debates. The next resolution gave rise to an animated discussion, in which many of those present took part. After a slight amendment it was unanimously adopted, in these words: —

Resolved, That while we adopt our theology on account of its Scriptural truth, we hold it preeminently valuable for the influences it is suited to exert upon personal character.

The next resolution offered by the Committee pronounced it "worthy of consideration, whether the changes which have been adopted by some of our congregations in the mode of conducting public worship be expedient." After remarks from several gentlemen, upon a suggestion that the passage of such a resolution might be interpreted as an encroachment upon the independence of our churches — the fundamental principle of Congregationalism, — it was voted that the resolution be laid on the table. The next resolution was couched in these terms, and after a few remarks by the President of the Convention, was unanimously adopted, the members rising and standing in silence till the vote was declared: —

Resolved, That the recent death of a venerable teacher of theology to many of the members of this Convention, Dr. Henry Ware, Sen., and also, of one of the former Presidents of the Unitarian Association, Mr. Justice Story, and of one of its Vice Presidents, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, calls for our solemn and affectionate commemoration of their Christian worth and valuable services in the cause of truth.

As it was now the hour for dinner, the Convention, after prayer by Rev. Mr. Furness of Philadelphia, adjourned to 4 o'clock.

At 4 o'clock the meeting was resumed. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Burnap of Baltimore. The Business Committee presented a report on the subject of organization, which had been recommitted

to them on the previous day. This report met with no objection, and was at once unanimously adopted. It was in these terms: —

Whereas the result of our Autumnal Conventions has been thus far highly satisfactory, and their regular continuance promises to further the religious interests of our denomination, and the cause of Liberal Christianity in general, alike by the interchange of sympathy, the discussion of Christian truth, and the quickening of Christian zeal: —

Resolved, That these Autumnal Conventions be regularly continued.

Resolved, That whilst we disclaim all authority on the part of the Convention over the individual churches, we earnestly invite our pastors and people to give their zealous cooperation in the purposes of the Convention.

Resolved, That at the opening of each Convention the following officers be chosen: —

A President, three Vice Presidents, a Secretary, and Assistant Secretary:

And that at the close of each Convention a Committee of Arrangements of five be chosen.

It shall be the duty of the President, to preside at all meetings of the Convention; or in his absence, one of the Vice Presidents.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary, to keep a permanent record of the proceedings of the Convention.

It shall be the duty of the Committee of Arrangements, to determine the time and place for the next meeting, and devise measures for giving it interest and efficacy, and to prepare and present topics for the consideration of the Convention.

Rev. Mr. Burnap then communicated the desire of his congregation, that the next Convention should be held at Baltimore. Rev. Mr. Furness presented a similar invitation from the society at Philadelphia. J. F. Polk Esq. expressed a wish that the Convention might be held at Washington. The Convention thought it best that the subject should be referred to the Committee of Arrangements; which was then appointed, to consist of Rev. S. K. Lothrop, of Boston, Rev. Samuel Osgood of Providence, Rev. Ephraim Peabody of New Bedford, Hon. Stephen Fairbanks of Boston, and Hon. S. C. Phillips of Salem. The last of the resolutions reported by the Business Committee was taken up, and after several had spoken upon it was unanimously adopted, as follows: —

Resolved, That while we steadfastly maintain the independence of the individual congregations, we cordially favor such modes of association and organization as may quicken the life and secure the purity of our churches.

The business of the Convention having been completed, Rev. Dr. Dewey, on behalf of the New York and Brooklyn societies, expressed their gratification at the attendance which had been given and the interest taken in the meetings. Rev. Mr. Lothrop proposed a vote of thanks to our friends who had shown such a cordial and generous hospitality; which was adopted by the unanimous assent of the Convention, the members rising, and pronouncing an emphatic Aye. Prayer was then offered by Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury, and the Convention adjourned *sine die*.

On Thursday evening the closing services in this series of meetings took place at the church of the Divine Unity; where, after prayer by Rev. Mr. Lothrop, a Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr.

Peabody of New Bedford, from 1 Corinthians xv. 14 and 20, on the moral results, in the history of the world, of the resurrection of Christ.

We have given the briefest account of the proceedings on this occasion, which was consistent with our wish to make an accurate record. Of its character we can only speak in the most general terms. It was altogether an agreeable and profitable season. Those who were present felt "how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to" meet "together in unity," and those who were absent lost an opportunity of spiritual edification as well as fraternal intercourse. These autumnal Conventions, if they should continue to be conducted in the same spirit of freedom and love, will be among the most efficient means of giving our denomination stability and influence.

Sunday School Convention. — A Convention of Sunday School Teachers was held at Salem, Mass., October 29, 1845, by invitation of those connected with the Schools of the four Unitarian congregations in Salem. A Circular was addressed to the Sunday Schools in the County of Essex, in the city of Boston, and in one or two other places inviting attendance and proposing several questions respecting the instruction and management of Sunday Schools. The Convention assembled in the Barton Square Chapel, in number, including pastors, superintendents and teachers, about three hundred. Hon. Robert Rantoul of Beverly was chosen *President;* Messrs. J. W. Foster of Portsmouth, and L. G. Pray of Boston, *Vice Presidents;* and Mr. J. C. Chamberlain of Salem, *Secretary.* After prayer by Rev. Dr. Brazer of Salem, Hon. S. C. Phillips, chairman of the committee of arrangements, read extracts from the replies to the Circular. A question proposed by the Committee, relating to the means by which a greater number of teachers might be obtained and a greater interest imparted to their work, was made the subject of discussion, in which many participated. After other exercises of prayer and singing, the Convention adjourned to the vestry of the North Church, to partake of a Collation. Mr. Phillips presided and offered some pertinent remarks. After which the members returned to the Chapel and resumed the discussions. Prayer having been offered by Rev. Mr. Stone of Beverly, several gentlemen spoke, particularly on the discouragements and encouragements of the Sunday School teacher. The Convention was then closed with prayer by Rev. Mr. Thompson of Salem. In the evening, however, the members again met at Tea in the Vestry, and were addressed by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; and afterwards in the Chapel, with parents and other friends of the Sunday School, where an address was delivered by Mr. G. F. Thayer of Boston, and remarks were made by various gentlemen. The day was enjoyed by those who participated in its scenes, and the example of this Convention will probably lead to other similar meetings. The Worcester County Association has, through a trial of some years, found such meetings of the teachers of different schools to be very useful.

Ordinations and Installations. — Rev. William B. Greene, of Boston, a member of the last Senior class in the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Brookfield, Mass., November 5, 1845. The Sermon

was preached by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston, from 2 Corinthians iv. 13; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Wellington of Templeton; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Parkman of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Nute of Petersham; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester; and the other services, by Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro', Rev. Mr. May of Leicester, and Rev. Dr. Thompson of Barre.

Rev. THOMAS B. FOX, late of Newburyport, was installed as Pastor of the "Church of the Warren Street Chapel" in BOSTON, Mass., November 9, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of New Bedford, from 1 Corinthians xv. 14 and 20; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Dr. Pierce of Brookline; the Right Hand of Fellowship was given by Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury; and the other services by Rev. Messrs. Huntington of Boston, and Thompson of Salem.

Dedications. — The "church of the Divine Unity," erected by the First Congregational Society in the city of NEW YORK, was consecrated by religious services, October 22, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows, pastor of the church, from Ezra vi. 5 and 16; the Prayer of Consecration was offered by Rev. Dr. Kendall of Plymouth, Mass.; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Farley of Brooklyn, N. Y., Furness of Philadelphia, Penn., and Osgood of Providence, R. I.

The meetinghouse just erected by the First Congregational Society in BRIDGEWATER, Mass., to take the place of their former house; was dedicated November 19, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bradford, pastor of the church, from Haggai ii. 7; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Richardson of Hingham; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Briggs of Plymouth, Russell of Hingham, and Hodges of Cambridge.

The chapel of the First Unitarian Society of TROY, N. Y., was dedicated November 14, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Harrington of Albany, N. Y., from Ezekiel xlviii, 10; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Troy; and the other services were performed by Rev. Messrs. Farley of Brooklyn, N. Y., Pierpont, and Harrington.

Protest against Slavery. — At a meeting of Unitarian ministers held during the anniversary week in May last, of which an account was given in the Examiner for July, a Committee was appointed to "draw up and circulate for signature among the ministers of the Unitarian body a Protest against the institution of American Slavery." Such a Protest having been prepared and transmitted to the different ministers of our denomination, has received the signatures of one hundred and seventy-three clergymen and preachers of our faith; being about two-thirds of the whole number. This Protest, which was excluded from our last number by the want of room, has been widely published in the Unitarian and other weekly journals. Still we think it too important a document, not to be placed in our record of ecclesiastical matters. Those who affixed their names to this paper, we are sure, were influenced by conscientious and Christian

motives; and those who withheld their names, we know, were constrained by not less urgent persuasions of duty. Imputations of other than right purposes and sincere convictions, on either side, are unjust, if not ungenerous. On a question of methods or measures they who agree on principles may be permitted to differ, without losing their confidence in one another. The Protest which we now give has been adopted as an expression of their own sentiments by the "Rhode Island and Massachusetts *Christian* Conference."

Protest against American Slavery, by one hundred and seventy-three Unitarian Ministers.

We, the undersigned, disciples of Christ and ministers of his Gospel, in bearing our solemn testimony against the system of American Slavery, deem it proper in the first place to declare the grounds of our action.

We owe it to three millions of Slaves, our fellow-men and brethren, to do what we rightfully can to undo their burdens. The wrongs of the Slave, however distant he may be, are our wrongs; for Jesus has taught us that every sufferer whom we can relieve is our neighbor, though a stranger, of another race, and in a distant land.

We owe it to Slaveholders, our fellow-men and brethren, whom we believe to be in a position hostile to the influences of Christianity, to speak a word of warning concerning the moral evil and inhumanity of the system with which they are connected.

We are the more obliged to bear this testimony, because the Gospel of Christ cannot now be fully preached in the Slaveholding States. If it could, it might be less necessary to express our views in the present form. But violent and lawless men, as is well known, and as recent instances in our own experience show, have made it impossible for the Southern minister to declare the whole counsel of God by speaking freely of that particular sin with which the community he addresses is specially concerned. Consequently Southern men of better character, who would not, perhaps, themselves sanction such constraint, are nevertheless left without instruction as to their duty in relation to Slavery. And if neither religion, nor the instincts of humanity, nor the first principles of American liberty have taught them that the system is wrong, their ignorance may not be wholly their fault, but it would be ours, were we to suffer it to remain. That they have been educated to believe that Slaveholding is right, may be a reason why we should not severely blame them, but it is also a reason why we should show them the truth; since the truth on this subject must come to them, if at all, from the free States, through books, writings, and public opinion.

These reasons would induce us to speak, even if the North were doing nothing to uphold Slavery. But by our political, commercial and social relations with the South, by the long silence of Northern Christians and Churches, by the fact that Northern men, going to the South, often become Slaveholders and apologists for Slavery, we have given the Slaveholders reason to believe, that it is only the accident of our position which prevents us from engaging in this system as fully as themselves. Our silence therefore is upholding Slavery, and we must speak against it in order not to speak in its support.

Especially do we feel that the denomination which takes for its

motto, "Liberty, Holiness, and Love," should be foremost in opposing this system. More than others we have contended for three great principles, — individual liberty, perfect righteousness, and human brotherhood. All of these are grossly violated by the system of Slavery. We contend for mental freedom; shall we not denounce the system which fetters both mind and body? We have declared righteousness to be the essence of Christianity; shall we not oppose that system which is the sum of all wrong? We claim for all men the right of brotherhood before a universal Father; ought we not to testify against that which tramples so many of our brethren under foot?

These reasons would lead us to speak individually and separately. But our combined voices may be heard more widely and be more regarded; and we therefore speak in company. As we do not, as a denomination, combine in subscribing creeds and fixing systems of theology, the more should we be ready to unite in practical endeavors to remove moral evils. As our principles of religious liberty do not permit us to exclude our brethren who are Slaveholders from our Christian fellowship, the more should we testify against the Slave system itself. Some individuals may think they hold Slaves for the good of their bondmen, in order to give them their liberty under more favorable circumstances. We cannot regard such Slaveholders as we do those who hold their fellow-beings as property for the sake of gain or personal convenience. Leaving to God to decide on the comparative guilt or innocence of individual Slaveholders, we pronounce the system unchristian and inhuman.

And more especially do we feel bound to lift up our voices at the present time, when the South has succeeded in compromising the nation to the support of Slavery; when it has been made a great national interest, defended in our national diplomacy, and to be upheld by our national arms; when the nation has, by a new measure, solemnly assumed the guilt and responsibility of its continuance; when free Northern citizens, without any alleged crime, are thrown into Southern prisons and sold to perpetual bondage: when our attempts to appeal respectfully to the Federal Courts are treated with contumely, so that the question is no longer whether Slavery shall continue in the Southern States, but whether Freedom shall continue in *any* of the States. Now, therefore, when our reliance on political measures has failed, it is time to trust more fully in the power of Truth. To the schemes of party leaders, to political majorities, to the united treasures, arms, domains and interests of the nation, pledged to the extension and perpetuation of the system, let us now oppose the simple majesty and omnipotence of Truth. "For who knows not that Truth is strong, — next the Almighty?"

We, therefore, ministers of the Gospel of Truth and Love, in the name of God the universal Father, in the name of Christ the Redeemer, in the name of Humanity and Human Brotherhood, do solemnly protest against the system of Slavery as unchristian and inhuman, —

Because it is a violation of the law of Right, being the sum of all unrighteousness which man can do to man, depriving him not only of his possessions but of himself. And, as in the possession of one's self are included all other possessions, and in the right to one's self are included all other rights, he who makes a man a slave commits the greatest possible robbery and the greatest possible wrong.

Because it violates the law of Love, which says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them."

Because it degrades man, the image of God, into a thing; changes persons into property; and, by violating the dignity of the human soul, is a constant sacrilege against that soul which the Scriptures declare to be the "temple of the Holy Ghost."

Because it necessarily tends to pollute the soul of the Slave, — producing all vices, and fostering habits of indolence, sensuality, falsehood, treachery, theft, moral stupor and perpetual childhood, — by taking away *hope*, which God has appointed as the lightener of toil, the spur of exertion, and the seed of progress, and by destroying the sense of responsibility, which is the bond that connects the soul with God.

Because it tends to defile the soul of the master, as unlimited power must generally produce self-indulgence, licentiousness, cruelty, arrogance and a domineering spirit, — qualities utterly opposed to the humility, meekness and self-denial of Christ. We cheerfully admit that some, both of the Slaveholders and Slaves, have nobly resisted these influences and shown us virtues which we should be proud to imitate. But we know that the prevailing tendency of the system is nevertheless evil, and that it must always offer manifold temptations and inevitable occasions to sin.

Because this system, as the indispensable condition of its continuance, must restrict education, keep the Bible from the Slave, make life insecure in the hands of irresponsible power, deprive female innocence of protection, sanction adultery, tear children from parents and husbands from wives, violate the divine institution of families, and by hard and hopeless toil make existence a burden.

Because Slavery, as all history testifies, eats out the heart of nations, and tends every year more and more to sear the popular conscience and impair the virtue of the people. It neutralizes the influence which we ought to exert on the world as a nation whose mission it is to extend the principles of political freedom. It degrades our national character, making us appear before mankind as solemn hypocrites, who declare "that *all* men are equal," and yet persist in holding a portion of them as slaves, — who declare that "*all* are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and yet take these rights from a sixth part of their own community. Constantly to profess one thing and constantly to practise another must destroy the sinews of national virtue.

In pure obedience to these principles, which no circumstances can obscure and no time can change, we protest against any attempt to defend this system on the ground that the Slaves are often treated kindly. It is not a question of treatment, but of right; and the greatest kindness would be no compensation for the rights which are withheld.

We protest against any attempt to defend the system from the letter of the Scriptures or from practices recorded in the Old Testament, as a libel on God and Christ, which would tend, so far as the attempt succeeded, to destroy our confidence in the Bible. If this system was not prohibited among ancient nations by positive law, it was not for the reason that it was right, but that, like polygamy and other evil practices, "it was suffered for a time because of the hardness of their hearts." And if, from the imperfect knowledge under

the old dispensation, "the times of this ignorance God winked at," yet now in the light of the Gospel, "he commands all men everywhere to repent."

Finally, while we prescribe no man's course of action, we earnestly implore all to put forth their full energy, and in the most efficient modes, to show decidedly their sympathy with the Slave, and their abhorrence of the system of oppression of which he is made the victim.

We implore our brethren at the South, especially those who hold the same faith as ourselves, to show their faith by their works; to come out from all participation in this sin, and, in the way they deem best, "to undo the heavy burden and let the oppressed go free."

We implore our brethren at the North, who may go to reside in Slaveholding regions, to go determined to make every sacrifice of profit or convenience rather than become abettors of this inhuman institution.

We implore all Christians and Christian preachers to unite in unceasing prayer to God for aid against this system, to lose no opportunity of speaking the truth and spreading light on this subject, in faith that the truth is strong enough to break every yoke. We pray them to remember those whose hearts were in this cause, who have ascended on high. If Channing, Follen, Worcester and Ware are still mindful of what is passing below, they must be looking to us to take their places and do their work. Wherefore seeing we are compassed by such witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and do the work of him who sent us, while it is day.

And we, on our part, do hereby pledge ourselves before God and our brethren, never to be weary of laboring in the cause of human rights and freedom, till Slavery be abolished and every Slave made free.

NOTICE.

We have determined, for the present year at least, to enlarge the size of our journal, that we may give a greater variety of contents, and may the sooner publish articles which accumulate upon our hands. Each number of the present and the next volumes will therefore contain one hundred and fifty-six, instead of one hundred and forty-four pages, by which we shall make an addition of seventy-two pages to each volume. The price remains the same as before. We shall therefore feel ourselves at liberty to return to our former number of pages after this year, unless our subscription list should justify a continuance of the larger size. Our present number, it will be perceived, contains a still farther addition of four pages — 160 in all — which we have given for the sake of including notices that we were unwilling to defer.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MARCH, 1846.

Art. I. — STUART ON THE APOCALYPSE.*

Professor Stuart has long occupied a large space in the theological literature of this country. He has exerted a wide influence, both by his writings and his oral instructions. He has been a teacher of teachers, and a multitude of disciples brought up at his feet have promulgated his expositions of the Scriptures in almost every quarter of the globe. His life has been prolonged beyond the average of the life of man, and he still continues to bear fruit in old age. He is one of the most industrious men of our times. He is truly German in his patience of labor and his power of producing books. He is reaping the fruit of all this industry in the enjoyment of an extensive reputation on both sides of the Atlantic. The sphere to which his studies have been principally confined is the most important of this period, and indeed of all periods of the Church,—the exposition of the Scriptures, the interpretation of the words of Christ and his Apostles, as well as the

* *A Commentary on the Apocalypse.* By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. Andover. 1845. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 504, 504.

teachers of the elder dispensation, — the sources to us of all religious opinion, the law of all duty, the foundation of all hope. He, who stands thus at the fountain-head, occupies the most commanding position in forming the religious opinions of the Christian world.

The position occupied by Professor Stuart has been the more important, as the foundation of the Seminary at Andover constituted an epoch in the theological history of this country. It was the period of transition from metaphysical to biblical divinity, from the abstract reasonings and speculations of Edwards, Hopkins and Emmons, to the investigation of the real meaning of the word of God, from bodies, or rather dry anatomies, of divinity, to the lively oracles of truth. This was beginning right. It was unavoidable, that good should grow out of it. It was the commencement of progress. The bringing of so many inquiring minds together, too, could not fail to liberalize them all. Had the old method been continued, of devolving the office of theological instruction upon the pastors of churches, with their meagre libraries, imperfect qualification, and absorption in professional duties, the old systems of school divinity might have been taught for ages, and real Christianity have continued to be overlaid and perverted by the traditions of the elders.

The Andover Theological Seminary has been said to owe its existence to the desire which was felt by the Orthodox of New England, to check the tendency that was becoming manifest, towards a more liberal theology; and it was thought by the friends of a more liberal theology, that such would be the effect of its establishment. But the event promises to disappoint them both. Never did the Orthodoxy of New England receive a more fatal blow. There has been in that institution, since the beginning, a constant tendency towards a more liberal theology; and those who rejoiced most over its foundation, have lived long enough to bewail its departure from what they esteemed the faith that was "once delivered to the saints." It has been mourned over in more than one school of the prophets and by more than one theological journal, as far gone from its original rectitude, as quite given over to latitudinarianism, and fast verging towards the worst errors of Cambridge and Germany.

Professor Stuart has had rare opportunity for study. He has had access to one of the best theological libraries in the country, with power to command any book which he might need for the investigation of any subject. The works of the Fathers, the judicious labors of the divines of England, the massive learning of Germany, have all been open to his examination. The correspondence of living scholars, too, has not been inaccessible for consultation and advice. With these great opportunities, what has Professor Stuart accomplished?

He has made himself a Hebrew scholar, and written a Grammar of the Hebrew language, — a work of vast mechanical labor. It is a good Grammar, and with other works of a similar character, is a valuable auxiliary in forming a verbal critic. He has written some criticism on the Old Testament, but his most partial friends must confess, that he has left that glorious, but unexplained book just where he found it. He has told us how we may ascertain the grammatical construction, and perhaps the literal meaning of its words, but the great and momentous questions, which rise up in the mind of every man of thought, as he reads that ancient record, he leaves untouched.

When the controversy sprang up between the Unitarians and Orthodox, after the line was distinctly drawn which separated them, Professor Stuart appeared as an able defender of the Trinitarian hypothesis. The discussion belonged to his department of theology, for the Trinity, if it can be supported at all, must be drawn from the text of the Scriptures. There was more learning in his defence of that dogma than in any other which has been published in this country. What was better than all, there was more candor and fairness in his defence. He had afterwards the ingenuousness, rare among theologians, to retract some of the positions he had taken in his first publication.

The next thing we recollect to have seen of his was a pamphlet on the "Eternal Generation of the Son of God," written in answer to Dr. Miller of Princeton. This was really a masterly performance, one of the most learned and able that have ever appeared in this country. It puts it beyond doubt, by the amplest citations from the Fathers, that the Ante-Nicene Christian writers to a man assert the

derived nature of Christ. Of course they were all Unitarians. This therefore we conceive to be one of the best Unitarian tracts that have ever been written. We know of at least one person, who feels greatly indebted to this work for his transition from Orthodoxy to Unitarianism.

The next publication of his that we recollect, was "A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews." It is a work of great research, and must have cost the author much time and labor. The mere manual labor of writing it must have been prodigious. Almost six hundred pages of closely printed matter are filled, to elucidate about twenty. There is abundant recitation of the opinions of the Fathers, Greek and Latin; likewise of German commentators. But the theological student, instead of being assisted by such a mass of materials, is rather confused, and rises from its perusal more in doubt than ever. The writer expends vast labor to prove a thing that never can be demonstrated, that Paul was the author of the Epistle. The Greek scholar, indeed, feels that the very style is a sufficient proof that it could not have come from Paul. The Epistle to the Hebrews afforded scope for the most consummate powers of criticism, and still affords it. It is the reconciliation of the Christology of the Old Testament with the Christology of the New. It is an attempt to show that the spiritual glories of the true Messiah far transcend the material and earthly glories of the ideal Messiah of the Judaic expectations. It brings up all the great questions of the criticism of the New Testament, — the quotation of the language of the Old Testament by the writers of the New, the distinction between doctrines and opinions, the difference between logical proof and analogical illustration, the relation of the Epistles to the Gospels, the question how far there is such a thing in the sacred writers as the *argumentum ad hominem* — reasoning upon premises that are conceded by the opponent, without regard to their substantive truth. These are the great questions which are brought up by the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and they lie far deeper than any verbal criticism, and verbal criticism without settling them, or without some attempt to settle them, is comparatively unimportant. Professor Stuart well knew that he was in the neighborhood of these great questions, and

sometimes shows that he had revolved them in his mind. But to have broached them, would have raised such a storm in his quarter of the Theological world as he seems to have been unwilling to encounter. One of the above subjects we know must have occupied his thoughts, — the question whether the writers of the New Testament did, or did not, quote the Old Testament in the way of accommodation; for he had given to the world a collection of the texts in the New Testament quoted from the Old, with the Greek of the Septuagint and the Hebrew of the original. He tells us in the advertisement, that "the subject, as every interpreter well knows, is replete with difficulties." And for what is he placed with means of investigation in his hands, but to clear up those difficulties, or at least to do all that he can to throw light upon the subject? The critic who gives dark and doubtful answers to such fundamental inquiries as this, deserts his pupil at the very point where he most needs his assistance.

We know that he may have said within himself, that by a prudent silence the discussion of these great questions might be put off for a while longer. But they must come up, and at no distant period, in the strongest of the strongholds of Orthodoxy itself. They are *the* questions of the present day, and not those of mere verbal criticism; the human mind has reached them; and any Commentary which leaves them out, or passes them over, is calculated for the ages gone by, and not for the edification of these times in which we live.

The next considerable work of Professor Stuart, was his "Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans." This Epistle has always been claimed by Calvinism as its strong-hold. The Orthodox world has agreed to consider it a discussion of the points at issue between the followers of the Genevan reformer and the Arminians, — original sin, total depravity, imputation, and vicarious punishment. Election and reprobation follow in the train. But there is a preliminary question, — whether these doctrines are made the subjects of direct teaching in that Epistle at all. The soundest critics have maintained, that the main subject of Paul in this composition was, to meet a practical question of that day, the amalgamation of those who had been Jews

and those who had been Pagans in the Christian Church, or in other words, the relative position of Paganism and Judaism to Christianity. We are of the number of those who consider the questions above stated, to make no part of Paul's purpose in writing his Epistle to the Romans.

But it is honorable to Professor Stuart, that at the peril of the denunciation of all the hosts of Orthodoxy, he refused to go the whole length of the revolting doctrines which have been drawn from the Epistle to the Romans by such men as Jonathan Edwards, or even his own colleague, Dr. Woods. To us, the paragraphs in the commentary on the Romans which exhibit this dissent, are more valuable than all the rest of the book. They show a degree of that personal independence which is the very essence of Protestantism, and without which all investigation degenerates into a mere partisan attempt to uphold that which is already established. But, for this deviation from rigid Orthodoxy, Professor Stuart was denounced from one end of the country to the other, as an apostate. He was mourned over by his old associates, as having lapsed into the camp of the New School Divinity, and we were credibly informed at the time, that it was made a special subject of prayer, that so important a champion of the cause might not be suffered to fall into the fatal error and heresy of believing, that God is just and good.

There is more merit, we think, in the Commentary on the Romans than in that on the Hebrews, greater enlargement of views, and the evidence of a more mature scholarship. But neither of them attempts to settle, or even discuss, those great preliminary questions, to which we have alluded, and on which the whole bearing and significance of both Epistles depend.

Within the past year, Professor Stuart has published a work still more elaborate than any which he had before produced, "A Commentary on the Apocalypse," extending to more than a thousand closely printed octavo pages. On the whole, it is the ablest, as well as the largest, of his works. It is a decided improvement on any thing that has appeared, to our knowledge, in the English tongue on the book of the Revelation. Its merits are, in the first place, negative. It honestly avows an ignorance of the precise historical application of the symbols of the

Apocalypse, and thus cuts off one source of ridicule and contempt to which all commentators have exposed themselves, who have pretended to find in that book the civil or ecclesiastical history of various periods of the world. In the second place, its merits are positive, in bringing together the materials by which the student of Scripture is enabled to make up his own opinion as to the origin and meaning of this production, even when it differs from that of Professor Stuart.

To the common readers of the Bible, the Apocalypse occupies a position altogether anomalous. It professes to be a revelation, but to them it reveals nothing. That which reveals, must itself be intelligible, or it is no revelation. If it is itself unintelligible, then it reveals nothing, and requires another revelation to inform us what meaning it is intended to convey to our minds. The Apocalypse is a vision, or rather series of visions, and the only part of the whole which is plain and obvious, is the epistles to the churches. These are simple, solemn, and truly Apostolic in their character, and unsurpassed in beauty and power by anything in the New Testament, except the discourses of Christ recorded in the Gospels: and they really offer the greatest difficulty in the way of those who are disposed to consider the book of Revelation a poem, written by some early Christian, who wished to embody in the shape of symbols the different prophecies which were then extant, of the future fate of the Church. The rest of the book is a series of pictures presented to the imagination, not themselves exhibiting any future scenes which are actually to occur, but only symbolizing them. To most of these scenes and symbols there is no explanation, no application to future events, no key to their interpretation. The consequence is, that a majority of readers look into the Apocalypse only occasionally, and then rather for entertainment than edification, as they turn over a book of engravings, or look into a kaleidoscope.

It has been so, in all probability, from the beginning. Dionysius of Alexandria, a scholar of Origen, about the middle of the third century, expresses himself in the following manner. "I will not, however, venture to reject the Apocalypse, because many of the brethren highly esteem it. On the contrary, I apprehend that this book

surpasses my comprehension, and that it is full of mysterious things. And as I do not understand it, I suppose that the words have a certain hidden meaning, which I do not pretend to measure, or to judge according to my capacity; but I behold them in faith as things above my comprehension. I do not reject what I do not comprehend, but admire it the more, the less I understand it." This was written within less than two centuries after the composition of the Apocalypse, by a man of great learning, who spoke the Greek tongue, was a native of Egypt, the land of symbols and symbolical writing, a man, moreover, who had access to Oriental learning. If he was unable to understand it, much less could the mass of unlettered Christians of the Western world in that and succeeding ages, who could read the New Testament only in translation and were unacquainted with the ancient pictorial and symbolic language of the East. The best evidence that it never has been understood, is the fact, that no two interpreters have ever agreed as to its meaning, or even as to the period of the world to which it was intended to apply, some confining it to the duration of the Roman Empire, and some finding the fulfilment of a part of its predictions in the career and fortunes of Napoleon Bonaparte.

The work of Professor Stuart fills two volumes of five hundred pages each. The first is entirely taken up with preliminary matters. The second consists of a commentary, with six copious notes at the end on particular passages, which are called by what seems to us the affected title of "Excursus." There is, besides, an appendix, containing an extract from Herder, about the poorest specimen, we think, we have ever seen of that pleasing and imaginative, yet dreamy and unsatisfactory writer.

The introductory volume is exceedingly elaborate, and is a work of much research. The theological student will find much in it to assist him in his inquiries as to the origin, design, author, and meaning of the book of Revelation. The first division introduces copious notices of the Apocryphal prophetical writings, which were either contemporary with the Apocalypse, or composed soon after, that throw light on the imagery and sentiments of that book. There is much in this section which will be new

not only to most English readers, but to most theological students. Nowhere else can these documents be found brought together in our language. After discussing the bearing of these compositions upon the Apocalypse, the author goes on to treat of the object of the book; the peculiarities of its form; its frequent use of mystic and sacred numbers; the plan of the work; its literary beauty, as addressed to the taste; the principles of interpretation which ought to be applied to it; the peculiarities of its style and language; the time, and place at which it was written, the persons to whom it was addressed, and who were its original readers. The rest of the volume is taken up in the investigation of the authorship of the Apocalypse, and in an exhibition, somewhat curious, of the various meanings which have been put upon it in different ages of the Church, with a list subjoined of the different authors in ancient and modern times, who have attempted to enlighten the world upon this mysterious subject. An appendix contains extracts from Victorinus, the oldest commentator upon the Apocalypse, and specimens from two of the Apocryphal books, which were treated of at the commencement of the work, the "Ascension of Isaiah," and the "Book of Enoch."

Professor Stuart has been complained of by members of his own theological household, for his pedantry and affectation. Those whose sensibilities are peculiarly acute as to offences of this nature, must have found themselves unusually tried in the first volume of this Commentary. The common reader will not only be scandalized, but puzzled, by the very headings of the chapters. He will look along on the tops of the pages, where he will naturally expect to find the utmost explicitness, and he will find the following titles: — "Numerosity of the Apocalypse;" "Economy of the Apocalypse;" "Æsthetical Character of the Apocalypse;" "Hermeneutical Principles applicable to the Apocalypse." Scholars who write in this way, seem to forget that the first purpose of a writer is, to be understood, and that to be understood, it is necessary to select such words as will not only express his meaning, but will be comprehended readily and by all.

It will not be expected, that within the limits of a review we should follow our author through the thousand

and eight pages of his Introduction and Commentary. The most that we can do is, to select certain points of interest, which he has made prominent, and offer a few observations upon them.

The first question which it naturally occurs to ask concerning the book of Revelation, is, — what is it? And the answer returned by all critics is nearly the same. It is a prophetical vision. The author states as a historical fact, that he was in banishment upon the isle of Patmos, and on the Lord's day heard a supernatural voice behind him, and immediately went into a state of ecstasy or trance, in which he saw various visions, and among other things, ascended in spirit to heaven and saw the throne of God and the heavenly hosts. No explanation accompanies these visions, though an angel points the attention of the seer to various symbols. What he sees he is directed to write in a book and send to seven churches of Asia, and they are left to make out the interpretation themselves; a consideration which seems to us important in determining the character of the whole work.

There is nearly as great unanimity among interpreters, as to the subject which is shadowed forth by the varied imagery of the Apocalypse. It is well stated by our author.

> "It lies upon the very face of the whole composition, I mean the prophetic parts of it, that the coming and completion of the kingdom of God, or of Christ, or in other words, the triumph of Christianity over all enemies and opposers, its universal prevalence in the world for a long series of years, and its termination in an endless period of glory and happiness, constitute the main theme of the writer, and is indeed almost the exclusive subject of his contemplation." — Vol. I. p. 155.

A better summary could not have been given. The *purpose* of the book lies quite as much upon the surface, as critics generally aknowledge. It is the confirmation of the faith of Christians, and their consolation under persecution, privation and martyrdom.

Thus far critics and commentators travel all the same road. But on the next question they divide, which is, — who wrote the Apocalypse; some deciding that it was written by John the Apostle, others by another John, a presbyter, who lived at Ephesus, others by an uncertain author, who used the name of John to gain credit and acceptance for

his composition. There is nothing in the book itself to settle the question either way. The ancients were as much in doubt about it as the moderns. The writer does not say, that he is John the Apostle. The style is so different from his, that the only way in which it can be supposed to be his, is the hypothesis, that the nature of the inspiration which is necessary to write prophecy, is so different from that which is necessary to write history, that it entirely changes the peculiarities of a man's style, and renders it no longer capable of being identified. Such being the case, it cannot be proved that the Apostle John was the author, neither can it be demonstrated that he was not. The authorship will probably remain, as it ever has been, a matter of opinion. Some will receive it as the Apostle's, and some will reject its Apostolic origin. Professor Stuart gives his suffrage to the *Johannean* origin of the book, to use his peculiar phraseology. In doing so, according to his own showing, he differs from almost all the eminent critics of the present day, both orthodox and heterodox, as well as the most distinguished of the last century. Semler, Eichhorn, Michaelis, Neander, and De Wette are scholars whose names, single or united, will go as far as human authority can go, to establish any point of sacred criticism. We have ourselves been accustomed to consider the Commentary of Eichhorn on the Apocalypse as one of the most masterly critical efforts which we know, and we are pained at the slighting manner in which Professor Stuart sees fit to speak of him, more especially as, if we are not deceived, he is more indebted to him, both for general principles and for details, than to any other writer whatever. We have not space to examine the process by which he gives the preponderance to the arguments, which go to show that John the Apostle was the writer of the book.

Closely connected with the authorship, is the canonical authority of the Apocalypse. If it was written by John the Apostle, of course it ought to be in the canon. But on the other hand, it does not follow that it ought not to be in the canon, if he was not its author. Mark and Luke were not Apostles, yet their Gospels are in the canon. Prophetic gifts were not confined to the Apostles. Few critics now consider the Epistle to the Hebrews to be the work of an Apostle, yet no one is disposed to cast it out of

the canon on that account. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse stand nearly on the same ground as to canonical authority. They are both in the canon of the Western churches. Neither of them contains any variations from the doctrines of the other books of the New Testament, which ought to bar its admission. Indeed, the question of their reception into the canon is no longer a matter of debate. They are there, and they cannot be excluded. Yet their uncertain authorship and want of universal reception ought to put them on a lower grade of authority than the other books, if we except some of the Catholic Epistles. No doctrine ought to be drawn from them, which is not clearly taught in the rest of the New Testament. Professor Stuart having decided in favor of the Apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, of course maintains its canonical authority.

The question which we shall next notice, is a point of still greater difficulty and delicacy than any we have considered. It is this, — what was the state of mind of the writer, whoever he might be? Was he in a state of prophetic ecstasy, when he saw those visions, so as to describe precisely what he saw, and as he saw it? Had he any choice as to what he was to record? Or were the truths made known to him in such a manner as to leave the selection of symbols to his own taste? Or is the whole a poem in prose, and the place and the visions, a part merely of the machinery and costume, which were chosen to embody and express certain predictions concerning the future fate of Christianity, which the writer had gathered from the prophecies of the Old Testament, as well as those of Christ and his Apostles? Into one of these categories must the Apocalypse obviously fall. The mind of Professor Stuart seems to have wavered among them, and scarcely to have settled clearly on any. Sometimes he speaks as if one were true, and sometimes another, and sometimes he confounds them one with another. He is not always consistent with himself. We should say that his prevailing view is, that it is a poem written under Divine illumination, or an inspiration suggesting the truth to be symbolized, and guarding the writer against all mistakes. On page 209 of the first volume he expresses himself thus. "The book, as we have seen, is a species of Epopee, —

different in this from every other prophetic book in the whole Scriptures, and resembling in part, i. e. as to the method of its structure, the book of Job, the Epopee of the Old Testament." Here we are obliged to resort to our dictionary. Johnson tells us, that Epopee means "an epic or heroic poem." The chapter on "Numerosity" seems to demonstrate this. The book bears, as he shows, the marks of consummate artistical skill. There are "episodes" in it, or "moræ," and "trichotomies," and an "epinikion," besides "parallelism" and "rhythmus." These things refer, certainly, rather to poetic than divine inspiration. And yet he says,

"Along with matters of fact, I must also class the presence of John in the isle of Patmos, the appearance of Christ to the eye of his mind, while in a state of ecstasy; and along with these, the messages, for substance, to be conveyed to the churches, and then the succession of symbolic phenomena that follow. That he saw all these with his *bodily* eyes, the Apocalypse not only does not assert, but even contradicts by the declaration, that John was in a state of prophetic rapture or ecstasy. The eye of the mind has sharper sight than that of the body; and the visions of the Apocalypse are by no means the less real visions, because they were discernible only by the eye of the mind." — Vol. I. p. 172.

What room is there, we ask, for poetry, or artistic skill, in relating a vision which comes and goes without the voluntary agency of the mind, and in which nothing can be chosen and nothing rejected? And yet, on page 183 of the same volume, our author speaks on this wise: — "If there be any part of the Apocalypse, where the writer is exposed to the charge of carrying his imagery to *excess*, it is certainly in the one before us. The locusts and horses are both objects of imagination merely, not actual existences." How can the writer be said to "carry his imagery to excess," if "the succession of symbolic phenomena" is supernaturally presented to "the eye of his mind," and his office is merely to describe them? Here is certainly some inconsistency, to say the least, a vacillation, palpably, from one hypothesis as to the composition of the Apocalypse to another. Farther on he says: —

"And if John be allowed to go beyond the bounds of real existences, in order to adorn and render impressive his composition, why may he not follow his imagination out, and present

all the glowing pictures which it portrays? It is plain and well known, that locusts and cavalry were the two greatest and most terrible scourges known in all the East, at the time when John wrote. Why may he not present them here, in accordance with the genius of Oriental poetry, endowed with preternatural forms and armed with extraordinary powers? To do so, is no more than all epic poets have done." — Vol. I. p. 183.

But what had John to do with this selection, upon the supposition that the "phenomena" were those of a vision presented by God to his imagination, and not chosen by his own will?

Having ascertained to his own satisfaction that John is the author, that the book is canonical, and was written under the influence of Divine inspiration, what does Mr. Stuart consider it as teaching? This brings us to the second volume, containing his interpretation, or *exegesis*, as he chooses to term it, of the Apocalypse. We have not space to follow him in his exposition of the several parts, and our general view of the character of the book has been sufficiently indicated in what we have already said. Instead, therefore, of attempting to establish or refute any interpretation which may be given of its symbolic or prophetic language, we shall in the remainder of this article examine a single point, which Professor Stuart treats in a manner that surprises us in a scholar of his critical attainments.

One of the most prominent doctrines of the Apocalypse, according to him, is the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ. This result, we confess, has filled us with unfeigned astonishment; for if there be any book of the Bible, in which the simple unity of God is taught, and the subordinate and derived nature of Christ, with more explicitness than the rest, this is it. We are sincerely grieved, that so false an impression should go forth afresh from the high authority of the Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. We deem this subject important enough, to occupy a few pages in examining the grounds on which such a doctrine is drawn from the language of the Apocalypse, and in some remarks on those passages which have a bearing upon this subject.

We begin with the first sentence: — "The revelation of

Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him." Further than this we need not go. This opening sentence speaks of Jesus Christ as a being separate from God, and denies to him the highest Divine attribute, an attribute without which no being can possibly be God in any sense, — that of omniscience. He who affirms that God gave or could give a revelation to Jesus Christ, denies both that he is God, and that he is omniscient. If Jesus Christ is God, or a second equal person of a Trinity, then he is all that the first person is, with the *addition* of the human nature. The first person cannot make a revelation to the second. Besides, it is "God," the whole Trinity, who makes a revelation to Jesus Christ. This, too, is said of him in his state of exaltation to heaven, when he had resumed everything Divine, which he ever had possessed, or ever was to possess.

Professor Stuart perceived the bearing of this introductory sentence, for he says: —

"With the particular meaning of this verb (gave) there is no difficulty: but the sentiment of the whole passage is a question of difficulty, if there be any; for this appears to represent the Redeemer, even in his glorified state (for such it was when the Apocalypse was written,) as dependent on the Father for a revelation of such a nature." — Vol. II. p. 3.

And how does he propose to get over it? A part of it he gets over by the dexterous fallacy of shifting terms in stating the difficulty, involving another fallacy, called by logicians *petitio principii*, a begging of the question: — "this appears to represent the Redeemer, even in his glorified state, as dependent on the *Father* for a revelation of such a nature." The text of the Apocalypse says no such thing. The words of the text are: — "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which *God* gave unto him." By substituting the term, Father, in the place of the term, God, he has taken for granted that the word, God, in that passage, means the first person of a Trinity, instead of the whole Deity, and by that substitution assumes the very thing in dispute, the truth of the Trinitarian hypothesis. Had he kept to the terms of the passage on which he was commenting, and said that "it represented the Redeemer as dependent on *God* for the revelation," he would have truly stated the whole difficulty, and in such a manner as to

make it what it is, totally unanswerable. And how does he get over the other part of the difficulty, that Jesus Christ is represented, even in his state of exaltation, as not omniscient, but dependent on another for his knowledge of futurity? Let us hear him.

"Most fully does Paul exhibit his belief in the sentiment of *mediatorial* dependence in 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. By this last passage it appears, that Christ remains in the state of *Vicegerent* merely, until the consummation of all things, when his delegated dominion will be given up. The texts in Mark xiii. 32 and in Acts i. 7 (compare Luke ii. 52) show, that Christ as to his human nature was *progressive* in knowledge, and of course there were some things not yet known to him in this nature before his ascension to glory; and among these was the particular and exact time of his coming. The "gave" of our text would seem, however, to imply, that even *after* his exaltation, the Mediator received those disclosures from the Father which are made in the Apocalypse. This is perfectly congruous with the view given by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, which necessarily implies the dependent state of the Mediator until the consummation of all things, and that his dominion as Mediator is only a delegated one. I may add, that the sentiment of our text is truly Johannean, whoever the author of it may be."—Vol. II. p. 3.

But to our minds, this is getting rid of one difficulty by plunging into others of still greater magnitude. This explanation asserts, if it asserts anything, that Jesus Christ is not *now* exalted to full Divinity, that he is Mediator in his human nature, he is Vicegerent without omniscience, and will not possess omniscience till the consummation of all things. Trinitarianism will be only *prospectively* true, till after the end of the world! The whole Presbyterian Church throughout the world is wrong, then, when it says, in its Shorter Catechism,—"The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, *and continueth to be*, God and man, in two distinct natures and *one person* forever." This shifting from Christ's Divine nature to his human nature, and from the human to the Divine, in order to avoid the force of certain passages of Scripture, which without such a convenient ambiguity would be utterly fatal to the doctrine of the Trinity, may be tolerated, by great indulgence, when it is confined to the ministry of

Christ on earth, but when this distinction is carried to the spiritual world, to a state of exaltation and glory, it becomes monstrous and incredible.

The other difficulty, in which Professor Stuart involves himself, is his appeal to Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. The passage to which he refers is this: — "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Is this "the end" of dependence on the part of the Mediator, when it says, "then shall the Son also himself be *subject* unto him that did put all things under him." If "subjection" means anything, then he will be more dependent than ever, instead of less so, and if he needed omniscience and full divinity, it must have been while he was acting as Vicegerent, instead of after he gave his authority up and was reduced to a state of subjection. But there is a feature in this passage presenting a still greater difficulty to the advocates of the Trinity. Christ is said to deliver up the kingdom "to God, *even* the Father." If Christ was God, he could not deliver up the kingdom *to* God. Such a delivery as is here described, could only take place between a being who was not God and one who was. "God" and "Father" are here used as terms synonymous and coextensive, and "Father" means not a person of a Trinity, but the whole Deity. This view is confirmed and rendered certain by the last clause of the quotation; — "Then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that GOD may be all in all." No language could be more explicit, to affirm that he who delivers up the kingdom is *not* God, and he who receives it *is* God, and the only God. Another circumstance, which increases the difficulty to the Trinitarian, is, that Christ is here called "the Son," his highest appellation, his name in the form of baptism — "in the

name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," — his appellation as a person of the Trinity, if that form proves a Trinity. Under that appellation he delivers up the kingdom to another, "that *God* may be all in all."

We say then, that Professor Stuart totally fails to clear up the difficulty which is presented to the doctrine of the Trinity in the very first sentence of the Apocalypse, and that it remains just where he found it, one of the most unanswerable arguments that that doctrine is not true, if John was the author of the Apocalypse, and that it was not believed when the book was written, if he was not the author.

On the next passage which relates to this subject — the salutation, we are glad to see Professor Stuart taking strong Unitarian ground. "Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is and which was and which is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth." He makes the phrase, "Him which is and which was and which is to come," to be, as it is, a circumlocution for Jehovah, the essential meaning of the name. "The seven spirits, which are before his throne," he considers to mean, not the Holy Spirit, but "the seven angels of God's presence," which are alluded to in the book of Tobit, — "I am Raphael, one of *the seven holy angels*, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in and out before the presence of the Holy One." But having come to this conclusion, a difficulty arises. How happens it, that these angels are associated with God and Christ in the salutation? The explanation is very satisfactory, but will lead somewhat further, we apprehend, than the author intended.

"If now it be said, that 'such an interpretation leads to angel-worship, or at least to the invocation of angels;' the answer is, that the Apocalyptist has expressly, and perhaps purposely, guarded us against such a practice in Revelation xix. 10; xxii. 9: — 'See thou do it not.' Or if it should be said, that 'there is no analogy and no example elsewhere of such an invocation as that before us, in case the text should be thus explained;' it would be well for the objector to consult 1 Tim. v. 21 — 'I charge thee before God, and Jesus Christ, and *the elect angels*.' How comes Paul to class these angels with God and Jesus Christ? Plainly because they, with God and Christ,

constitute (so to speak) the supreme court of heaven, or that awful judicatory which will take cognizance of all the actions of men. Here now, the Holy Spirit is either omitted by Paul, or else impliedly comprised in the word 'God;' and 'the elect angels' are appealed to as witnesses of the solemn charge which Paul is about to give. And why? Because they are 'ministering spirits;' they watch over and report all which is done by the professed disciples of Christ. Compare also Rev. iii. 5; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; xii. 8; where a similar idea is found. In a light somewhat different indeed, the Apocalyptist presents them as the dispensers of divine blessings to the churches. What he says is this;—It is his fervent desire that the blessings of grace and peace may be bestowed on the seven churches of Asia, blessings which Jehovah dispenses, by his presence angels, and by the Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ. The definite and specific part which each is to perform in this dispensation of blessings, the writer does not designate; nor is it his purpose to do so. Enough that this was already understood by his readers; and surely he addressed them as if he supposed them to be acquainted with the subject in general. In fact, an act of direct homage or worship is not necessarily involved in such wishes as the Apocalyptist here expresses. They amount simply to this, that he fervently hopes for and desires the bestowment of important blessings on the seven churches of Asia, on the part of those superior guardians of the churches, who are primarily and principally concerned with the bestowment of them. If any one should say to an ambassador, appointed to a foreign court — 'I heartily wish you a favorable reception from the King and his Counsellors,' this would not assert, nor even imply, an equality between the two parties named. Neither does the inclusion of guardian angels in the wish which accompanies the salutation of the author before us, imply, that he makes them equal to God and Christ, or the proper objects of religious worship." — Vol. II. p. 22.

This is very well said. But the author was not aware, perhaps, that he was destroying one of the strongest arguments for the Trinity. All the salutations and benedictions in the New Testament are swept away at once, as proof texts of the Trinity, or of the Deity of Christ. If it is not necessary that the seven presence angels should be equal to God, and Christ, because they are included in the salutation, neither is it necessary that Christ should be equal to God, or be God in any sense, because he is associated with God in the same salutation. All those texts, then, are nullified as arguments for the Deity of

Christ, which run in this way: — "Grace, mercy and peace, from God, our Father," (or "God, the Father,") "*and* the Lord Jesus Christ." And above all, the grand proof-text is lost as an argument for the Trinity, contained in the last verse of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: — "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." In fact, only one of these subjects of discourse is God, by the very terms of the sentence — "*and* the love of *God*." We have only to repeat the words of our author, — "an act of direct homage or worship is not necessarily involved in such wishes" as the Apostle here expresses.

But Professor Stuart asserts, that Christ is worshipped in the Apocalypse, and therefore he must be God. This, he does not directly assert, but evidently implies, is done in the next sentence to that which we have been considering. We do not deny that Christ is worshipped in the Revelation, but we do deny that he is worshipped as God, or for the possession of Divine attributes, or for doing anything that God alone could do; and affirm that he is always worshipped in such connexion with God, as makes him a distinct being from God, and as shuts him out of Deity, instead of including him in it. We proceed with the ascription. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us a kingdom [i. e. kings], priests unto God, even his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." This is Mr. Stuart's translation, and he concludes his comment thus:—

"Here, then, is a doxology, or ascription of honor and dominion to the Saviour, through endless ages. And this sanctioned by a solemn, Amen. In what light must John have viewed the Saviour, in order to make such an ascription to him? If it be said, that John has done so through mistake, and because his feelings were overpowered by the splendor of the vision in which the Saviour appears; then why is he not corrected here, as he is in Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9, when about to direct his homage amiss? Instead of this, we find him, in this book, often repeating the same ascriptions of praise to the Lord Jesus, as are rendered to God the Father; and this even Eichhorn and Ewald confess. Plainly nothing less than spiritual homage is paid to the Redeemer here, — a homage which the writer prays may ever be continued." — Vol. II. p. 29.

Professor Stuart does not say, that the homage here paid

to Christ is *supreme*, that is, paid to him as God. Though it would seem that he wishes his readers to draw that inference, as would appear by the question he asks and leaves unanswered, — "In what light must John have viewed the Saviour, in order to make such an ascription to him?" He merely says, that it is "spiritual homage." But there are circumstances about it which demonstrate it, however "spiritual" it may have been, not to have been supreme, not paid to him as God. And it was these considerations, doubtless, which led him to speak as he has done in a preceding paragraph, of the two ascriptions, "glory" and "dominion." "To him be glory, means, to him let the Church render honor and respect; for this is giving glory to God, as we commonly express it." Of the ascription, "dominion," he observes:—"When the writer had just said of the Lord Jesus, that he is 'the first born of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth,' is it not appropriate to attribute dominion to him here? In the later Greek, superior command, lordship, dominion, regal authority is often designated by κρατος; and why not retain its usual and appropriate meaning here?"

But there is another and more cogent reason for confining the meaning of these ascriptions to "honor and respect," to which our author has omitted to advert. The action for which those ascriptions are given, is one which the Supreme Being could not do:—"for he hath washed us in his own blood, and made us a kingdom of priests unto God, even his Father," or more correctly, "unto his God and Father." Now the Supreme Being has no "blood" to shed, and no "God and Father" to redeem mankind to. The person to whom the ascription is rendered, cannot be God, by the very terms of the phraseology. The ascription, then, is paid to Christ's inferior nature, if he had two natures, both because mention is made of his shedding his blood, and of his having a God. The Divine nature of Christ, if he has one, cannot possibly have a God. These circumstances therefore ruin the argument for Christ's Deity drawn from worship in the Apocalypse, by presenting a plain case in which it is paid to his inferior nature.

The next attempt to establish the Deity of Christ, is from the eighteenth verse of the first chapter, from the first address of Christ to the seer of the vision; and we

confess that it has filled us with amazement. After describing, according to our author, the apparition as wearing a human form, "one like a son of man" — one like a man, he proceeds: — "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet, as one dead; and he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, even he that liveth." We give the author's translation, and now add what he pronounces to be the "meaning." "I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; and therefore I am able to perform all that I promise, either in respect to the rewarding of my friends or the punishing of my enemies." But the Professor says, and says truly, that this verse ought to be joined with the next. Let us put them together, using his own translation still, and see what sense will be made of them, substituting, in the place of a part of the first verse, the meaning which he puts upon it: —

"I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; I was dead indeed, yet behold! I live forever and ever, and I have the keys of death and hades."

Who is this that dares to put either a miserable quibble, or else a flat contradiction, into the mouth of the God of truth! "I am the eternal and *unchangeable* Being, who *always* lives. I was *dead* indeed, yet behold! I live forever and ever." Scripture, under such treatment, becomes a succession of riddles, which would have puzzled Œdipus himself. We know the supposition of the two natures, by which this interpretation is justified. Our author resorts to it on another occasion, which we may appropriately quote in this connexion. The same person, who, according to Mr. Stuart, claims to be "the eternal and unchangeable Being," in the seventh verse of the next chapter makes this promise: —"To him who overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the paradise of *my* God." The question immediately suggests itself, — how can "the eternal and unchangeable Being" have a God? Let us learn.

"Some have felt a difficulty here on account of the expression, '*my* God.' But why should they? Does not the newly risen Saviour speak of *my* God in John xx. 17? And does he not say the same in Revelation iii. 2, and four times repeated in iii. 12? Why might he not say *my God*, as well as my Father? For the Father is God. Besides, had he not a human nature as well

as a Divine? And could he not truly say with respect to this, *my Father* and *my God?* Those who make such objections seem to forget that Christ is θεανθρωπος (God-man), and that what he says, at any time, is to be applied to the one nature or to the other, *pro re natâ* [according to occasion.] All serious difficulty vanishes, when the matter is viewed in this light. We may add, also, that so long as the *human* nature remains in union with the Divine, such language will never be inappropriate. Whether this will *always* be, perhaps the Bible has not expressly said; yet it is difficult for us even to entertain a supposition which would deny this." — Vol. II. p. 67.

But where does Professor Stuart get his authority for asserting thus strongly, that Christ was "God-man?" There is something heathenish and fabulous in the very expression. It bears the impress of those ages of the world, when the human mind teemed with such imaginary beings as the Chimæra and the Centaurs. Not only has there been a coalescence of God, or a Person of the Trinity, with a human being, but our author suggests the possibility of its being *dissolved* again. "Whether this will be *always*, the Bible has not expressly said." The passage of Scripture, to which he refers, as suggesting such a thought, says nothing of the dissolution of the union of two natures, but merely of the resigning of a kingdom "to God," — by a person, of course, who is not God, — that "*God* may be all in all." We ask again, on what authority does Professor Stuart assume as a fact, that Jesus Christ was and is "God-man?" He has no right to use this as a fact, in order to explain passages of Scripture which would otherwise be fatal to the doctrine of the Trinity, until he has proved it to be a fact. It cannot be known in any other way than by express revelation. The Bible nowhere says, that Jesus was God-man. It is a mere *inference* drawn from certain texts, itself uncertain from the very nature of inference. The doctrine of the Trinity is likewise an inference, according to its boldest advocates. What strength can there be in an argument built upon a pile of inferences?

But let us apply our author's principles to his own criticism. "What he says at any time is to be applied to the one nature or to the other, *pro re nata*," that is, according to occasion. But he says that Christ appeared to John and laid his hand on him, saying, "Be not afraid; I am the eternal and unchangeable Being, who always lives; I was

dead indeed, yet behold I live forever and ever." Does the speaker in this case give any intimation, that he changes the person in passing from the first to the second part of this speech? Such a paradox, unexplained, would be hardly dignified, not to say honest, in a human being. Among children such a thing would be considered a riddle, or a conundrum, not to be admitted even into serious conversation. But there is no necessity for changing the person. The "*res nata*," the occasion for changing the person, arises entirely from the necessity of sustaining the Trinitarian hypothesis. Indeed, a parallel passage occurs in the eighth verse of the second chapter, in which the two parts of the sentence appear in such immediate connexion as to make it impossible to change the person from the Divine to the human nature, for one is the antecedent and the other the relative. "These things saith the first and the last, *who* was dead and is alive." Now no one but the merest quibbler will maintain here, that the relative is not coextensive with the antecedent; and if so, the application of the phrase, "the first and the last," to Christ does not prove that he was the "eternal Being." The phrase itself, "the first and the last," has the meaning of dignity and pre-eminence, as well as duration, and we think we may say, rather than duration. To give it the meaning of duration, makes the sentence an anticlimax as well as tautological. It makes Christ say, that he is the *eternal* Being, and then, as a predicate, that he *lives*. In that case, the predicate is comprehended in the subject, or the first predicate is implied in and swallowed up in it. We therefore reject that interpretation as excluded by the connexion, and consider it a phrase of dignity, preeminence, and not of duration. The sense then will require no such incredible change of persons, and will be nearly synonymous with another expression often used in the same connexion, "the first born from the dead,"—our leader into immortality. And the meaning of the whole passage will be this; "Fear not, I am the prince of immortal life; I was dead, but I am alive forevermore, and I have the keys of death and hades." I returned from the place of departed spirits, which others have no power to do. Agreeably to this conception, Paul says of Jesus, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that slept."

In another place, "And he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, (the chief,) the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have *the preeminence.*"

But Professor Stuart asserts, that if Jesus does not claim the attributes of Jehovah in this passage, he does in chapter xxii. 13: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." We deny that the writer has put these words into the mouth of Christ. Jesus does not speak till the sixteenth verse, — "I Jesus have sent mine angel." The words are spoken by the angel in the name, not of Christ, but of Jehovah, "the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets," spoken of in the sixth verse. The idea that they are spoken by Christ arises from an entire misapprehension of the Christology, — to use one of Mr. Stuart's terms — of the Apocalypse, which is the Christology of the whole New Testament; that is to say, the ideas then prevailing of the nature of the coming and kingdom of Christ. We will cite a few passages which will throw light upon this subject.

It was not the idea of the Jews and early Christians, that Christ was to come alone to judgment, or that he should come by his own power. He was to come by the power of God, and judge and reign with God, by the power of God, and as the assessor of his throne; and God himself was to be sensibly present with his people, as will appear by the following quotations. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God *and* our Saviour, Jesus Christ." They were to come together. "The appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his own times He shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen or can see." Christ is to come not by his own power, but by the power of God. Not only is God to bring Christ with him, but all his pious followers, who are already dead. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him." He will not reward his followers by his own power, but only declare what God will do for them. "Come ye blessed *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." God and the Messiah are to

dwell with the saints. "The throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it [the New Jerusalem], and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face, and his name shall be in their foreheads." "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God."

God, then, will come to judgment, according to this representation, as well as Christ, and Christ is to judge only by delegated power. Hence such expressions as this, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men *by* Jesus Christ." So it is with entire propriety, that in the seventh and twelfth verses of the last chapter of the Apocalypse, the angel personates God when he says, "Behold, I come quickly," and in the latter passage adds, "And my reward is with me, to give unto every man according as his work shall be."

That the angel personates Jehovah when he says, "I am Alpha and Omega," in the nineteenth verse, will appear more clearly, if we compare the whole paragraph from the sixth to the fifteenth verse with a part of the preceding chapter, from the fifth to the ninth, which is parallel to it, and in which the angel *certainly* personates Jehovah. "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write, for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable and murderers, etc." This certainly cannot be said by the angel in the person of Christ. Compare with this the second paragraph, commencing with the sixth verse of the twenty-second chapter: — "And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true; and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly." Repeated again in the twelfth verse: — "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me to give every man as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed are they

that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, etc."

We say then, and we hope we have clearly shown, that Revelation xxii. 13 does *not* make a claim of divine attributes for the Saviour, "the force of which," as Mr. Stuart maintains, "cannot be fairly avoided." We have shown that the angel personates Jehovah in that passage, and not the Saviour. Jesus begins to speak in the sixteenth verse: "I Jesus have sent mine angel." He is the angel of Jesus, not because Jesus is Jehovah, but because he is sent forth by Jehovah and Christ, or by Jehovah in furtherance of Christ's cause. Nothing can be more marked than the distinction which is kept up through the whole book between Jehovah and Christ, who is generally called "the Lamb." Everywhere it is "God and the Lamb." There is nowhere any intimation that the Lamb makes any part of God. On the contrary, he is everywhere shut out of Deity by the particle *and*, — "God *and* the Lamb." Homage, it is true, is represented as being paid to both in heaven, but that homage is paid to one as God for essentially Divine attributes, but to the other for that which excludes Divinity, and in language which excludes Divinity. Jehovah is worshipped in such terms as these. "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." When the Lamb is worshipped, it is for very different reasons. "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, *for thou wast slain*, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." One is worshipped because he is "Lord God Almighty," and because "he has made all things;" and the other, because "he was slain, and redeemed us *to* God by his *blood*."

Professor Stuart accuses Eichhorn and Heinrichs of adopting a certain interpretation, to avoid the inferences which would be drawn from the true rendering. While we are upon the subject of worship, let us see if he has not laid himself open to the same imputation. When we saw that Mr. Stuart considered the Apocalypse as teaching the Deity of Jesus Christ, many passages in it immediately

occurred to us so contradictory to that hypothesis, that we felt a curiosity to see how he would explain them. Among others there is a passage in which a multitude is seen who have been victorious over idolatry. As Moses and Christ have been the two main instruments in the hands of God in destroying idolatry, when arrived in heaven they are represented as singing "the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb." Of course, in this instance, instead of representing the Lamb as an object of worship, the writer represents him as a worshipper of Jehovah, and as joined with Moses in that act. Such a representation is pregnant with a strong presumption against the Deity of Christ. It occurs in the second verse of the fifteenth chapter. "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, *saying*, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name, for thou only art holy, for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest." Although the song is put down, which they sung, being pointed out by the word, "saying," still because the word, "song," is twice repeated, Mr. Stuart will have it, that there were two songs, one sung *by* Moses, and the other sung *to* Christ. But let us hear how he makes it out.

"*The song of Moses* naturally relates to the triumphal song recorded in Exod. xv., sung after the deliverance of the Hebrews from the Egyptians, i. e. the martyrs in heaven sang a song of anticipative triumph, holding it for certain that all which had been signified by symbols would be carried into execution. *And the song of the Lamb*, i. e. the song which is sung to the Lamb as the Captain of Salvation, who is certain to triumph. Ewald chooses another way: 'The song which Moses and the Lamb have both sung in heaven, in view of triumph.' But where is the Lamb associated in worship with any created being? Such an interpretation revolts against the spirit of the Apocalypse." Vol. II. p. 305.

If this be not a case of forcing an interpretation to prevent an inference, we have never seen one. We say,

that the representation is in exact accordance with the whole spirit of the Apocalypse. Christ, or the Lamb, is not represented as God, even in his highest state of exaltation. There he represents himself as dependent, subordinate, derived, as *having a God*, which Deity cannot have. In the messages to the churches, in which he speaks of himself as "searching the hearts and reins," he speaks of Jehovah as not only his Father, but his God. "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of *my God*." "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of *my God*, and he shall go no more out, and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, New Jerusalem, which cometh down from *my God*." The Jewish Messianic idea is carried out through the whole book; which was, that the Messiah should be, not God, but "exalted to the right hand of God," to reign by his power and under his auspices, according to the cxth Psalm, — "Sit thou *at my right hand*, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." God, as the Jews supposed, promised in the second Psalm, that he would make the kingdom of the Messiah universal. In the eleventh chapter of Revelation there is a shout in heaven at the accomplishment of this prophecy. "There were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of *his* Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." In the twelfth chapter, — "I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of *his* Christ."

In those passages which represent Christ as being worshipped, it is everywhere in his regal dignity, as exalted by God to a participation in his throne, as it were; but never as God. Everywhere he is carefully separated from him. In the seventh chapter: — "After this, I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation *to our God* who sitteth upon the throne, *and* unto the Lamb." In the fifth chapter: — "Blessing and honor and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, *and* unto the Lamb."

And finally, in the New Jerusalem there is "the throne of God *and* of the Lamb."

Not only has Professor Stuart deduced the doctrine of the Trinity from the text of the New Testament, but he has subjoined a long note, or "excursus," as he calls it, in which he gives this doctrine as a reason for the use of the numbers three, four, seven and twelve, as sacred or symbolic numbers. We call attention to this note as one of the most curious specimens of theological speculation, that we have ever seen. We extract a few paragraphs from it by way of showing how the human mind may sometimes reason.

"Over all the Eastern world, are to be found the most indubitable traces of an original *monotheism*. The conception of this divine unity, however, has received peculiar modifications among heathen nations. I will state some of them as briefly as the case will admit. A self-existent, eternal Being, the original Source of all creatures, and all worlds, and of all the gods who made and govern them, lies at the basis of all the ancient Oriental theosophy." — Vol. II. p. 413.

This he goes on to prove and illustrate by reference to the Hindoos, the Medes and Persians, and the ancient Egyptians. It was taught among the Greeks by the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy. But he proceeds to show that some kind of a Trinity in the Divine Nature was equally universal.

"God, the original source of all things, has developed himself. The creation, rational and irrational, exists. In the developments which the Godhead has made, his personality, so to speak, has become perceptible to the rational beings whom he has created. And it is a fact, astonishing at first view, but not more astonishing than true, that nearly all the leading nations of antiquity, with whose theosophy we are acquainted, have represented this development as *threefold* or *tripartite*. In other words, the doctrine of a Trinity, in some form or other, seems to be at the basis of all the ancient and celebrated systems of religion. God developed or disclosed, is represented as God in a threefold relation to his creatures."

This he labors to show by reference to the Heathen nations we have already named. These polytheists and idolaters he makes out to have been, in some sense, Trinitarians! What pleasure he can take in finding him-

self in such company, we are at a loss to imagine, as the corruption of religion arose from violating the Divine Unity, and this especial corruption was one of the principal causes, according to the admission of all, that made a special revelation necessary. But farther: —

"In forming the idea of God, the human mind must transfer the views of things within the circle of its knowledge and perception to the Divinity himself, and then abstract from them whatever there is of the finite and imperfect in them. So the Scriptures everywhere employ anthropopathic expressions, and describe the Godhead by applying to it names of attributes that designate the parts, passions and conceptions of men. Like to this is the use of ideas borrowed from human views of some leading and striking features of the universe; which latter was regarded by the ancient world as impressed, in some important respects, with images or rather symbols of its Creator. Thus the universe as a whole has three parts, the upper, the middle and the under worlds; I speak, of course, according to the views of ancient times, in which the Hebrews also shared. A like division is heaven, earth and sea. So sun, moon and stars. Time, a striking image in some respects of the Infinite One, is divided into past, present and future. So morning, noon and evening. Time and space in all our limited conceptions of them, have beginning, middle and end. 'The universe and all things,' says Aristotle, in accordance with the Pythagoreans, 'are limited by the number three.' So of persons, first, second and third. How easy now, and natural even, (we may add,) to make three the symbol of the all-perfect and infinite One, who is and was and is to come." — Vol. II. p. 417.

We know not how this may strike others, but for ourselves we say, that it fills us with unspeakable amazement. What conceivable connexion there can be between the premises and conclusion, we are utterly at a loss to divine. It reminds us of an argument, well known to most of our readers, by which a certain logician attempted to prove that there are seven sacraments. "Why, Sir, are there not seven cardinal virtues, — seven mortal sins, — seven golden candlesticks, — seven heavens? Are there not seven wonders of the world, — seven days of creation, — seven planets, — seven plagues?" The Professor proceeds: —

"In accordance with this we find *three* most extensively employed in the heathen world, as significant of whatever is divine, creative, or productive. As in numbers it forms the

first complete composite unity, which is indivisible, so in forms and figures that are purely mathematical and ideal, it bears a most conspicuous part. The triangle is the basis of almost all geometrical figures, and is itself unresolvable into any other." — Vol. II. p. 417.

On this we make no comments, but merely remark, that if it were not in a serious argument, we should be tempted to put it down as a satire; first, because totally illogical, and secondly, because if it prove anything, it shows clearly that the doctrine of the Trinity is just what its opponents have always pronounced it to be, derived from an origin purely Pagan and Heathen. This is made still more evident from the next extract.

"The Mosaic religion differs, in one important respect, widely from all the heathen systems brought into view. An *impersonal* God it knows not. An original, eternal, impersonal cause of all things, is never even hinted at. Nor is the doctrine of the Trinity, as such, *explicitly* revealed in the Old Testament. Monotheism is most strenuously inculcated, and everything that would lead directly to tritheism, or polytheism (into which all the heathen systems early degenerated,) is most scrupulously, and (as it would seem) purposely avoided, in order to guard against the lapse of the Hebrews into the religion of the heathen. But still there is, after all, an occult reference to a plurality in the Godhead. De Wette himself acknowledges that there is a threefold idea of God in the Old Testament, as supreme Governor, as God revealed, and as the Spirit who operates in all things. For a plurality of nature, one has often appealed to the plural form of the noun אלֹהִים, and to such expressions as 'Let *us* make man;' 'Let *us* go down;' 'Become like one of *us*.' But this appeal is too indefinite to support the allegation. Much more to the purpose is the threefold blessing, which Moses and Aaron were commanded to pronounce over the congregation of Israel: — "Jehovah bless thee and keep thee, Jehovah make his face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee, Jehovah lift his countenance upon thee and give thee peace." This is called putting the name of Jehovah upon the children of Israel. How well this corresponds with 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you,' needs scarcely be mentioned. Nor can we help calling to mind also the formula of baptism into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Obvious too is the meaning of קָדוֹשׁ, קָדוֹשׁ, קָדוֹשׁ, (holy, holy, holy,) and the *trisagion* in Rev. iv. 8, accompanied by the designation of the Eternal as he who is, and who was, and who is to come." — Vol. II. p. 418.

Now unfortunately for this last quotation, this ascription in the Revelation is given to but one person of the Trinity, and that person is the Father according to our author; for the Lamb is not yet introduced. It is "to him that sitteth on the throne." Afterwards worship is given "to him that sitteth on the throne *and* to the Lamb." Now if there was a Trinity in Him that sat upon the throne, because he is worshipped as "he who was and who is and who is to come," then when the Lamb was added, there were four persons worshipped. And if there are three persons worshipped in heaven, how happens it that the Holy Ghost is not seen, nor mentioned, from the beginning of the Apocalypse to the end?

As to the benediction quoted in proof of a Trinity, there is no Trinity in it, by the very terms in which it is expressed. Only one of the subjects of discourse is God, and that is the second. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, *and the love of God*, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you."

Such are the arguments for the Trinity which Professor Stuart draws from the Old Testament, from Heathen antiquity, from the sacredness of the number three, and from the Apocalypse. We leave every one to judge of their conclusiveness as he sees occasion.

Among the notes at the end of the second volume, there is a very good one on the "Angelology" of the Scriptures, and another on the "Millennium." Indeed there is a great deal of valuable information scattered up and down through the thousand and eight pages of the two volumes. We are glad they are published. They constitute some of the best Orthodox criticism we have had in this country. Hints are thrown out in them, which will be pursued by other minds to very different results from those arrived at by their author. Although originating in a source professedly Orthodox, there are speculations in them which lead directly to the broadest Rationalism. And it is on that side that our fears of late begin to rise up. Our country must pass through the same process which Germany has gone through. There is a progress among all sects, and the momentous question is, where will it stop?

We are greatly in want of a deep, thorough, religious, Biblical criticism and theological literature, to guide the young

and adventurous who are commencing their theological investigations. We want a well written "Christology," which shall reconcile the apparent Judaism of the New Testament with the spirituality of Christ's teaching and the real history of the Christian Church. With such a book in his hand as a key, the Apocalypse would be a much plainer book to the unlearned as well as the educated inquirer.

We want a new criticism and analysis of the Old Testament, not skeptical and captious, but reverent and believing, which shall discriminate more accurately than has yet been done, between what is divine and what is human in it. At present, the whole Bible is interpreted not by the increasing light of knowledge, but in accordance with the creeds adopted in the twilight of the Reformation. The consequence is, that the Bible is brought into conflict with science, with reason, and with conscience.

We want a new work on the Prophecies. There is, at the present moment, no safe guide upon that subject. The consequence is, that the prophetical parts of both the Old and New Testaments are complete mysteries, and are passed over as such by most of the readers of the Bible.

We naturally look for such works to the Professors of our Theological Seminaries. Parochial clergymen have neither the time nor the facilities for such investigations. They can be successfully pursued only by those who have access to ample libraries, and sufficient leisure for deliberate and careful examination. But Theological Professors cannot accomplish impossibilities. Their ordinary duties may be as arduous as those of the parochial clergyman, and leave them as little time for the composition of books. Theological Schools therefore look back to the community for support, patronage and enlargement. The liberality which has so largely endowed the Theological Institution at Andover we consider worthy of all praise. It is only by the division of labor, created by a number of Professorships, that leisure can be afforded to each for independent investigation.

Would that our own School had five Professors, instead of two! Would that we could bear a larger part in creating the theological literature which is to form the religious opinions of the rising millions of our growing country! G. W. B.

Art. II. — SCHISM IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.*

Mr. Wilbur's book and the various pamphlets occasioned by it give us a tolerably accurate account of the rise and progress of the schism in the Quaker Community in New England. The author's personal history affords a melancholy exhibition of the effects of religious bigotry and intolerance. Persecuted for his attachment to what he considered the primitive doctrines of Quakerism and for his conscientious opposition to the formalism and unsound opinions of the majority of the Society, and finally disowned and denounced, he has not profited by his experience, nor learned the lesson of Christian moderation and charity. His tribulations have not taught him wisdom. We believe him to be, in the main, a good man; but misled by his enthusiastic feelings, and desirous perhaps of the honors of martyrdom, he spares no terms of reproach against the authors of his sufferings. The introduction to the book is a loud wail over the alleged apostasy of a large portion of the Quaker Society. The allegation is unquestionably true. The Society have departed from the principles and the spirit of George Fox and William Penn. Nor do we think that the recent seceders from it are much nearer the genuine Quaker orthodoxy. Still though the fact of the alleged apostasy cannot reasonably be denied, we think that Friend Wilbur might have been expected to show more of a Christian temper towards his opponents and persecutors. Even in theological controversy it is scarcely courteous, to accompany charges of heresy and apostasy with ungenerous insinuations of dishonest motives. A good cause is harmed by such a course, and a bad one is rendered more odious. It may be that the charges were sustained; but we cannot reconcile it to our consciences to deal so freely, not to say flippantly and in the worst style of theological polemics, with the character of a professedly Christian Society. The truth does not demand it; and charity at least forbids it.

---

* *A Narrative and Exposition of the late Proceedings of the New England Yearly Meeting, with some of its subordinate Meetings and their Committees, in relation to the Doctrinal Controversy now existing in the Society of Friends.* By John Wilbur. New York. 1845.

Making this abatement from the value of the book, we are now prepared to say, that as a statement of facts respecting an important ecclesiastical movement, we have read it with interest. In all our controversial reading we have hardly met with an instance of such open, unblushing, almost avowed, persecution for opinion's sake as in the instance before us; nor of more decided artifice and prevarication in the conduct of an argument; nor of more deliberate determination, not only to silence the objections, but to ruin the character of a religious opponent. We think therefore that Mr. Wilbur had just cause of complaint, and of appeal to the judgment of the public.

Our readers do not need to be informed that for several years the Society of Friends has been agitated with intestine dissensions, growing chiefly out of differences of opinion respecting the genuine doctrines of that Society; nor that these agitations have resulted in a schism, — both parties, as usual, claiming to be the depositaries of the unperverted truth, and representatives of the founders of the Community. This claim neither party can, in our opinion, substantiate. They both appeal to what we may call the symbolical books of the Society; for in this case, as in so many others, the Christian Scriptures are supplanted by the formularies of the Church. The Episcopalians appeal to the Articles and the Homilies; the Presbyterians, to the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Catechism; the Quakers, to George Fox, William Penn and Robert Barclay. Now we, standing without the circle by which their theological vision is bounded, and having no personal or denominational interest in the issue of their controversies, are decidedly of the opinion, that neither of the combatants is truly orthodox when judged by their own standards. The spirit of Quakerism has long been dead. The extinction of its vitality has nearly been fatal to the existence of the Society, from which so much was once hoped in favor of the freedom of the human mind. Quakerism itself in its genuine simplicity, as a religious system built on the doctrines of the Divine Unity and the influence of the Holy Spirit, has almost ceased to have a being. There is not enough remaining to give a character of consistent unity to the Society.

We once supposed that Quakerism was friendly to

freedom and to a lofty spiritualism. We had so often read in Quaker authors the scriptural expression, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," that we believed the Quakers heartily adopted it and preached Christianity as a Gospel of freedom. We have lived to see our mistake. We find, if not in Quakerism, at least in Quakers, a melancholy narrowness of views, a suspicious watchfulness against any attempt to depart from the symbols of the Society as interpreted by the Rabbins who sit in the seat of Moses, and a determined spirit of resistance against any influences derived from the growing light and knowledge of this age. Quakerism systematically shuts itself out from these influences. It condemns them as worldly and profane. It becomes rigid and exclusive. It frowns upon the idea of advancement. So far from advancing beyond the wisdom of its founders, it has receded from it and disowned it. That wisdom was what it professed to be, "a primitive simplicity, Christianity reduced to a determination of our will to act in conformity to the will of God, as we may know it on every occasion, and even in the most complicated circumstances," by means of the continual indwelling of his spirit. It is because Quakerism has abandoned this primitive simplicity, and sought to supply its place with doctrines having no foundation in reason or Scripture, that its glory has departed, and a cold, dead formalism has settled down upon the Society. The ancient Friends rejoiced in the life and power of godliness, which enabled them cheerfully to bear their testimony in an ungodly age, and to count it joy to endure persecution for the sake of Christ. The history of modern Quakerism compels us to ask ourselves, whether these have not been exchanged for the love of worldly influence and dominion over the consciences of men; — whether the maintenance of the Discipline be not an object of as great importance in the eyes of Quakers, as the purity of the creed or its practical efficacy upon the life.

But what has their Discipline done for them? Has it prevented degeneracy of morals, or differences of opinion? Has it maintained the unity of the Society? The weakness of the Quaker Discipline was not perceived so long as the external pressure of persecution was continued. Their common trials and sufferings bound them together, and

kept them in the purity and simplicity of their original estate. When in the course of the advancing civilization of the world that pressure was removed, and persecution for conscience' sake ceased, it was seen that no Discipline, however rigid, could prevent the intrusion of thought within the domain of theology, nor perpetuate an unvarying uniformity of opinion. It was by resisting the inevitable tendencies of thought, by placing themselves in opposition to the onward progress of the world, that they brought upon themselves the calamitous events that have distinguished the later years of their existence. Calamitous we may well call them, not so much in regard to the growth and outward prosperity of the Society, as in reference to the declension of its inner life, and to the increase of an uncharitable and denunciatory spirit. And we may add perhaps, that these events have jeoparded the hope of its long-continued existence as a separate organization. No creed or discipline, however cunningly devised or authoritatively enforced, can suppress those questions, which men in some form or other will always ask respecting their relations to God and to immortality; nor can any answers, however just, silence all doubts and scruples.

Religious communities must also be prepared to answer another class of questions, those, namely, that touch the social and moral welfare of mankind. These are not to be evaded nor put off with barren generalities. If a community stands upon its dignity, or shuts itself up in sullen separation, or refuses to bestow its notice on any moral or philanthropic enterprise which is exciting profound interest in the minds and hearts of mankind, it must make up its account to be destroyed or rent, or to be left behind, in the progress of the world, a monument of its imperfect adaptation to the wants of an age to the measure of whose thought it has not grown. Men earnestly engaged in great moral enterprises will not be restrained by bands of doctrine and discipline, by forms of faith and modes of church government. Several of the largest religious organizations have recently experienced this truth. They have been shaken by internal dissensions growing out of diversities of opinion respecting such questions, not less than by diversities of opinion upon religious doctrines. Instead of meeting these questions frankly and answering them in

accordance with the acknowledged principles of Christianity, they have either evaded them, or disowned and endeavored to injure the individuals most active in effecting the proposed reformation. The Quakers, like others, have found the inefficacy of their Discipline in restraining the expression of opinion. Disownment has lost its terrors. The Preparative, Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in all the plenitude of their power, cannot prevent earnest and faithful men from exposing formalism and hypocrisy, and sounding the claims of social duty in the ears of a careless generation. A little band of bigots, gathered in some obscure "meetinghouse," cannot increase the effect of their spiritual decisions by excluding offenders against the Discipline from the ordinary courtesies of social life. Society will not regard them as so excluded. The time has gone, if it ever existed, when a Community could be formed to the feelings and habits which Christianity requires by any Discipline, however rigidly enforced.

The immediate occasion of the division in the Yearly Meeting, was the visit to this country of Joseph John Gurney, a member of the Society in England. He has been represented to us as a man of learning, wealth and general culture, of polished manners, extensive intercourse with the world, and a zealous preacher of his distinctive views of religion. In these he seems to have departed further from original Quakerism than even the Yearly Meeting, — in fact, to have been a Quaker in name only. Our readers can judge whether he belongs to the same Church as William Penn, when we remind them that he inculcates the doctrine of the Trinity, the Calvinistic view of the Atonement, the sacredness of the Sabbath, and the efficacy of outward Sacraments; that he regards Christ as outwardly the enlightener, in opposition to the Quaker doctrine of "Christ himself the evangelical and saving light and grace in all;" that he attributes a paramount authority to the Scriptures, looks favorably upon forms of devotion, and teaches us to expect the resurrection of the same body that dies. If these points do not involve an actual renunciation of primitive Quakerism, we have read its story to little purpose. In the inculcation of them he was sustained and encouraged by the New England Yearly Meeting. John Wilbur, a member of the South Kingston (R. I.) Monthly Meeting, and

an approved minister, had previously opposed the views of Gurney in England, and pursued the same course upon his return to this country. His object was to show that Gurney was an unfaithful preacher of Quakerism, judged by the acknowledged standards of the Society; and that the tendency of his preaching was, to increase formalism and outwardness, by diverting attention from the fundamental doctrine, namely, that "true religion in all its parts and articles springs from this divine principle, the Light of Christ in man, as the manifestation of God's love for man's happiness."* It was contended, that the generally received views of the atonement and of imputed righteousness were not only inconsistent with Christianity and Quakerism, but tended to the loss of the spirit, life and power of that religion, which is immediately revealed by Christ in the soul and mind of man. In short, that the modern orthodoxy of Friends is an abandonment of their ancient spiritualism.

The controversy with Gurney necessarily brought Wilbur into conflict with the majority of the Society in New England. To silence without answering him, they summoned him before their ecclesiastical tribunals on a charge of violating the Discipline, in that he had published books on the dogmas of Quakerism without subjecting them to the revision of the Society! He repeatedly invited them to a comparison of Gurney's doctrines with their symbolical books. Evading the true issue, they replied that this was not a question of doctrine, but of discipline. Following up this disingenuous beginning with misrepresentations of his character and opinions, they at last succeeded in procuring his "disownment," first by the lower and then by the higher tribunals. This result, however, was not attained without suppressing the Monthly Meeting to which he belonged, and uniting its members with another more yielding. This is Quaker liberality. It is also an approved, long-standing method of avoiding the inconveniences of unrestricted discussion. We had supposed, that he who publishes his opinions with a view to influence or change the opinions of others, has no right or reason to complain of any examination of his views, however critical, provided it be made in a candid and charitable spirit. His opinions become the

* William Penn.

property of those whom they may concern, either to approve or reject.

The separation from the Society of those who sympathized with Wilbur soon followed his disownment; and now, as in the case of the Presbyterians and Methodists, we have two Quaker schools or parties, each calling itself the Yearly Meeting, each claiming possession of the genuine, primitive Quakerism.

Much as we regret the necessity or supposed necessity that urged to such a course, we have no doubt that the motive which impelled the seceders to form a separate organization, was in the highest degree praiseworthy. They mourned over the prevalent coldness, formalism and want of spirituality. They traced these evils chiefly to the unsound doctrines that had obtained the favor and support of the Society. They supposed that by bringing Friends back to the purity and simplicity of the Gospel as held by the founders of their body, they were taking an essential step towards recovering them to the life and power of religion, which so distinguished the martyrs and confessors of Quakerism. Of these martyrs and confessors no true Quaker need be, or can be ashamed. We do not wonder, that the good and the gifted in the Society should wish to vindicate their names and memories from the rude attacks of men, who under the guise of Quakerism assailed the purity of their doctrines and the integrity of their conduct. The Christian Church contains no names that we more sincerely honor than those of many of the early Friends. We honor them for their earnest and unquestioning devotion to the claims of duty, for their self-sacrifice and self-denial, their spirituality and lofty enthusiasm for truth and right. And we can sympathize with those who would rescue the Society from the peril that threatens it, if the views of Gurney and his associates should obtain a permanent ascendancy, namely, to become an inconsistent mixture of Quakerism and Episcopalianism.*

* Or, of Quakerism and Presbyterianism. Dr. Wardlaw of Scotland says, "J. J. Gurney's views on the doctrine of justification are clear, simple and scriptural, but are they Quakerism?" "It is really impossible to read the writings of the older Quakers without being sensible that there is a prodigious softening down, on the part of this writer, of their opinions and language." "It cannot fail to strike the most superficial reader, what a perfect discordance there is between the

In one respect we cannot but regret the division in the Quaker Society. It has destroyed our idea of the unity, order and beauty of a Friends' Meeting. Our early and long-continued impression of the Friends was that of a community dwelling in "exceeding peace," bound together by the spirit of love as well as by unity of doctrine, — a model of a harmonious, well-ordered commonwealth. Some personal intercourse with Friends and acquaintance with their earlier history induced us to form a delightful picture of their personal purity and social rectitude. Especially lovely to our view were their religious meetings, so calm, so thoughtful, so overshadowed by the Divine presence, — apart from the agitations of the world, disturbed by no controversies, and shielded by the discipline and spirit of the Society from difficulties among fellow-worshippers. A nearer view dissipates the enchantment, and reveals Friends not only as of the same passions as other men, but as prone to indulge them. We confess that in reading the various and contradictory accounts of the rise and progress of the separation in that Society, we have been deeply pained by frequent manifestations of a most unchristian spirit. Like all sectaries, who assume that the peculiarity of revelation must consist in certain dogmatic opinions, and that the obedience of faith is an implicit assent to these opinions, partisans among the Quakers accuse each other of heresy, apostasy and pernicious doctrines, of impure motives and base ends, in the too common style of polemic theology. Acting in the spirit of these mutual accusations, they can also resort to expedients to accomplish the ruin of a brother's reputation and religious standing, which are unworthy of the most disreputable classes of politicians.

We regret that this example should have furnished a new illustration of the almost universal tendency of religious controversies to degenerate into angry quarrels, and to terminate in the imputation of dishonest motives and in open ruptures. We know that this is the usual, but we would

---

writings of Mr. Gurney and those of the early Friends. I am very far from wishing Mr. Gurney to take a single step out of Quakerism, in points where Quakerism is true. In other points, however, he has already taken several, and those, too, even larger strides than any that now remain for him to take."

fain hope not the inevitable course, in which discussions upon the highest and most sacred truths should proceed. We console ourselves with the reflection, that when the tempest rolls away, the purified atmosphere will minister more abundantly than ever to the spiritual health of those who have passed through its trying scenes; that truth, separated from error and formalism, will exercise a wider and more benignant control; and that mankind, taught by so many painful experiences, will recognize the fallacy of making Christianity to consist in precise theological speculations, and the folly of attempting to restrain the freedom of individual thought and action by the instrumentality of ecclesiastical discipline. J. M. M.

Art. III. — SAINT AUGUSTINE AND HIS WORKS.*

The beautiful edition of the works of Augustine, whose title is placed below, leaves nothing to be desired by the student who would acquaint himself with the genius and character of this great thinker of the Ancient Church. It would exhaust our pages even to mention the names of his various productions. We can speak only of a few, and of those which stand at the head of their respective classes.

As a man, Augustine reveals himself most fully in his Confessions. For an excellent English edition of them, with important notes and illustrations, we are indebted to the Oxford Library of the Fathers to which we have already referred.† All who are acquainted with this book will allow it to be as remarkable as any that was ever written. It unveils without the least reserve a life of singular experience. The substance of its narrative we have already given.‡ Notwithstanding its details of early

---

* *Opera S. Aurelii Augustini. Post Lovaniensium Theologorum Recensionem castigata, etc. Operâ et Studio* Monachorum S. Benedicti. Paris. 1836 — 39.

Works of Saint Augustine. Revised and corrected from the edition of the Theologians of Louvain. By the Benedictine Fathers. Eleven Vols. in 22 Parts.

† Number for January, 1846, p. 1.

‡ Ib. p. 9, et seq.

vices, it is worthy the perusal of every thoughtful mind. In deep and impassioned devotion, and in boldness and range of thought, it blends the piety of the Psalms of David with something of the daring meditation of the Platonic Dialogues. It cannot be appreciated at all without careful attention to the progress of the author's mind. Let one only get hold of the main thread of the narrative, and there is no fear of receiving any harm from its pages.

Yet we cannot but wonder, certainly at first thought, that a grave prelate at the sober age of forty-three should write such confessions. And yet on reflection, the fact is by no means unaccountable. Upon reaching any important period in life, men of thought are very apt to review the past, and form plans for the future; to look back from the present eminence along the road they have travelled, and forward along the way they are to advance. The bishop of Hippo, when he found himself at the head of an important see, might very naturally retrace his singular path, consider his former trials and present failings, and rally his powers anew for the future. If we feel disposed to accuse him of want of delicacy in speaking so freely of his youthful licentiousness, we must remember that much that we call delicacy is but a fashion of the time, and has failed to bear that name with many of the wisest and holiest of our race; and besides, that his views of his conversion and of baptismal regeneration would lead him to regard all that took place previously, as having little, if any connection with his present spiritual state; so that he wrote as if recording the passions and sins virtually of another person. We have been offended at much in these confessions, but the offence has passed away after reading them in connection with the progress of his views and life. It surely must have been no ordinary piety that could pass in review such a life, and make every past sin so glowing a lesson of faith and devotion. In fact, the high tone of fervor that pervades the whole book surprises us more than anything. It seems unnatural that so large a volume should be written in the strain of prayer or of direct communion with God. There is nothing like it that we remember in the sacred literature of our age. There are enough of records of signal religious experience, enough of pious volumes of meditation. But we look in vain for a work in which the

whole life, with all its temptations and sins, all its studies in philosophy, all its struggles, failures and successes, has the attitude and breathes the language of devotion, and when it is not a prayer, is a conversation with God. Yet we see enough of the workings of religion in many writers to understand the kind of feeling that animated Augustine, and to lead us to ascribe its remarkable degree in his case to his singular experience and peculiar temperament.

We were never but once in society reminded of Augustine's fervent tone, and that was in conversation with a very humble person, who inherited the blood which the African sun warms into such fervor, and who, in the simplicity of Christian faith and gratitude, delighted to speak of a life extended to a century, in something of the same impassioned devotion that marks the Confessions of the renowned bishop of Hippo. It is undoubtedly the burning piety of this book, that has given Augustine so strong a hold upon Christian hearts in all ages, and made his name precious to many who have little sympathy with his peculiar doctrines. He must be a man of cold heart and narrow mind, who will not rejoice at the progress of the writer's faith, bless his passage from the Manichean's deifying of evil and veiling of the true God in darkness, into the faith that regards evil as the perversion of created good, and looks to a benignant Deity made manifest through a divine man, and calling the soul to relations of personal affection with himself. The eleventh book of Confessions, which describes the writer's remaining temptations, and the two closing books, which give his meditations on the creation, may serve to explain the aim of his work. The record of his mind is thus brought up to the time of writing, and closes with a revelation of the thoughts that were then struggling within him. These thoughts on creation, time, eternity, the soul, God, are not wholly clear, but are intelligible enough to show what process was going on in a mind so reverent and so daring. The dimness comes not from a passing cloud, but rather from the *nebula* of a forming world.

We must now speak of Augustine as a controversialist, and as we cannot touch upon all his controversies. we select his principal one, his opposition to Pelagius. The man is always to be pitied, who is called to take part in a contro-

versy that arrays against him the force of his own previous labors, although the inconsistency may be more apparent than real. The orthodox Protestant, after having battled against Papal pretensions to infallibility, is always somewhat puzzled when a Christian of the liberal school turns against him his own weapons, and in the name of reason, Scripture and liberty challenges the authority of his dogmas. So too the liberal Christian, after arguing with the Orthodox, is troubled when the free-thinker takes the same attitude against all authority in religion, and denies the right of any man to judge for another as to what is Scripture, or whether Scripture is infallible. He must be an able controversialist, who can maintain his ground well against a double assault, and whilst he charges the enemy in front, does not leave the rear defenceless. Augustine was placed in a similar position between two antagonists. As a convert from the Manicheans, he of course felt himself called upon to deny the necessity and eternity of evil and advocate the free-will of man. In the zeal of his new faith he began his work on the free-will before he left Rome, and completed it after becoming a presbyter in Africa. His conversation, letters, and sermons exhibited the same tone. His efforts were concentrated upon one chief point, the Manichean heresy and its antidote. He produced great effect by his labors in this direction. His conversion had created as much sensation among his former associates, as would the conversion of a Paulus or Strauss among the German neologists of our own day. Crowds thronged to hear the famous neophyte, and among them not a few of his old companions in error. He won signal laurels, and many hardened heretics acknowledged the power of his appeal.

This was well, and Augustine blessed God for having made him the instrument of so glorious a work. But when, some years after, the monks Pelagius and Cœlestius began to speak and write of the dignity of man, the power of the will, the value of self-reliance, and to make human effort more conspicuous than supernatural grace, Augustine evidently felt not a little troubled. In fact, so late in life as the time of composing his Retractations, a man of nearly four-score years, on the verge of the grave, he recurs to the charge of inconsistency brought against him by the Pelagians, and labors not a little to reconcile the statements

in his earlier work on the free-will with those of the treatise on nature and grace. We do not see that there is good ground for accusing him of any shuffling arts or truckling expediency. His change of position was the natural result of the progress of his mind under its peculiar experiences and circumstances. He had been led to reject the monstrous error of the Manicheans, that evil is an eternal necessity, in fact, a God; and very honestly he attacked this doctrine, and asserted the origin of evil in human will. He had also been converted from his errors and sins by an agency not his own, by human ministrations and direct Divine grace; thus in his conversion he had the fundamental principle of the doctrines of original sin, election, and free grace, which he afterwards urged with such power. This principle would in the nature of things act with an increasing force, as he felt the fearful power of evil around him, the obstacles to the diffusion of Christianity, and the need of trusting in the Divine grace. What at first he vaguely hints, he at last boldly urges, — that human freedom and existing evil are to be reconciled by the doctrine, that man was created free, but lost his free-will in the first transgression, was then cut off from Divine communion, the whole race virtually acting in the first man, and that nothing but the overpowering grace of God can restore man to his freedom, remove original sin, and renew the communion with Heaven. Thus we have the great elements of his system, the doctrines of original sin and irresistible grace. Pelagius maintained opposite ground, maintained that all men were born as pure as Adam, and might keep so by a proper use of their faculties, and of the Divine aid offered to all. Thus the greatest controversy in Christendom, next to that between Athanasius and Arius, sprung up; a controversy that has been renewed in every age, and probably will be renewed until the end of time, for its origin lies in the various constitution and experience of men.

Wrong is done to Augustine, and to the true bearing of this controversy, by ascribing the formation of his opinions and the change from his previous ground, to his hostility to Pelagius and his doctrines. This charge has become a common-place thing, and is found in quarters as various as our English historian Priestley and the German Giesseler.

Schleiermacher impeached its truth, and Neander has demonstrated its falsity. The latter has shown conclusively, that Augustine declared opinions substantially the same as those he advocated against Pelagius, long before the controversy sprung up, and appeals in proof to a letter written to Simplician, bishop of Milan, as long before as the year 397. The two tendencies now at issue had long existed in the Christian Church, and only wanted the right men to bring them to a crisis. Augustine and Pelagius were the men to do this, marked out for it probably by native disposition and temperament, surely by education and experience. In the one we see the enthusiastic apostle of faith and grace, in the other the mild champion of conscientious duty and moral freedom, in fact the Paul and the James of the Church in its imperial age. Like Paul, Augustine had been converted, as it seemed to him, by a direct sign from heaven after a life of fierce passion; like James, Pelagius had been apparently a disciple from the beginning and had no violent nature to subdue. These same opposing characteristics appear in the third century in the fiery Tertullian, a convert from Heathen errors, and the mild and philosophic Origen, who had been educated in the bosom of the Church; nay, they characterize the general tone of the theology of the Greek and of the Roman Churches as distinguished from each other.

Pelagius received Christianity more directly from the East. He was intimate with Rufinus, a pupil of the liberal, perhaps the latitudinarian, Origen. He was a Briton, and of course educated in a church that derived its principles from the East through missionaries from Gaul, as was the case with all the Celtic Christians. Michelet will have it, that Pelagius was a native of Brittany, that province of France, so distinguished for personal freedom and individuality, the land of Abelard, the great liberalist of the middle ages, and of Descartes, the father of modern metaphysics. We will not try to spoil the eloquent Frenchman's brilliant analogies, especially as his view does not essentially militate with the common opinion as to the country of Pelagius. Whether born in England, Wales or France, he of course was of Celtic blood, and subject to the same tendencies of religion and temperament, and in either case deserves his name, *Pelagios*, the dweller by the

sea. His doctrines show traces of themselves in the remains of the Celtic Church, whether we consider the monks of Iona in the Hebrides, or of Lerins in France, or whether we look to the Culdees of Scotland and Ireland.

As a monk, Pelagius must have been saved from Augustine's temptations and conflicts, and both from position and temperament he must have viewed the Divine Being, human nature, and Christian salvation differently from the flaming Numidian doomed to such struggles with error and vice, and saved at last through a baptism of fire. We aim not to enter into the particulars of their controversy. Their lives interpret its origin, and their mode of conducting it reflects honor upon their temper. This controversy has been continued virtually in all ages, yet to the end of time the names of the Numidian bishop and the British monk will be used to designate the rival opinions concerning the nature of man and the way of salvation. Neither the ghostly and imperious St. Bernard contesting the claims of reason and will with the elegant and rationalizing Abelard, nor the dogmatic Italian, Aquinas, battling with the subtle Briton, Scotus, nor the Jesuits struggling with the Jansenists, nor the Calvinists with the Arminians, nor the Evangelical with the Liberal sects, have been able to eclipse the original controversy or hide the names of the original combatants. They were first in the open field, and fought the battle well. Viewed in the broad vision and calm light of subsequent centuries, their experience and position so interpret and justify their opinions as to teach us charity, if not to silence debate, and to make us wish that modern controversialists would always make allowance for diversity of gifts, and strive, as did Augustine and Pelagius, to show that under that diversity there may be the same spirit. Augustine spoke of his antagonist respectfully and even affectionately. We cannot praise him for acquiescing in the imperial decree for the heretic's final banishment; but while we condemn his course, we must not forget how wide a range of good men even in modern times the condemnation of intolerance comprises. Only he who advocates the broad toleration first asserted in modern times by the founder of the State of Rhode Island, can presume to assail the great name of Augustine for his treatment of Pelagius. If we wish to see the difference between intoler-

ance of heart and intolerance merely as a result of custom, we must compare Jerome, the monk of Bethlehem, with Augustine, the theologian of Hippo. The conduct of Jerome is open to universal censure, except by those who are as cynical as he, — watch-dog of the Church, as he was proud of being called, and making it his especial business to bark at all heretics, being, as Jortin facetiously remarks, the founder of the great and growing sect of *barkers*. The tone in which he abuses Pelagius, and also the less questionable reformers, Jovinian and Vigilantius, reminds us of the language with which that noted divine of his time in Massachusetts, Cotton Mather, heaped his epithets of odium upon Roger Williams and Samuel Gorton of Rhode Island.

Although we cannot ascribe Augustine's doctrines of sin and grace to his controversy, we may ascribe to this something of the rigor and exclusiveness with which he held them. Theological controversy is always dangerous, and each party is far more apt to hurt himself than his opponent, to warp his own mind than to work his opponent's conversion. The two looked at different sides of Christian salvation, the one most upon the human, the other most upon the Divine side, until by too exclusive contemplation they became one-sided in their views, and Pelagius was in danger of a self-reliance that leaned toward self-righteousness, and Augustine verged towards the borders of fatalism. Now that very few, if any, adopt the whole extent of Augustine's creed, we stand in no fear of contradiction in ascribing something of this evil to his strifes. He was made too much a man of one idea, and might have been narrowed down into a mere dogmatist, had not his position soon called him to treat a topic as broad as Christendom.

Before passing to his treatise on that topic, the City of God, let us observe, that the emphasis, with which Augustine urged the power of original sin and the need of divine grace, must have tended strongly to guard the Christian Church against some peculiar dangers, especially that of arrogant formalism and self-righteousness, and was needed, moreover, in an age of singular tumult and wickedness, to save the faithful from despair and lead them to trust in a power whose grace is beyond human force or understanding. His system is liable to run into Antinomianism or the disparagement of good works, as Augustine saw that in

some cases it did, although he denied that this was a just consequence, and rebuked the authors of the Antinomian movement, the monks of Adrumetum. It is but fair to say, that, however differently we might infer from the nature of the case, those denominations of Christians who have inclined to the Augustinian school have been peculiarly strict in morals and zealous of good works, as has been the fact with the Jansenists and Calvinists of modern times. The sense of sin thus inculcated works mightily upon the soul, and when thus wrought upon, its energies always seem to move earnestly, and the very instincts of our nature act of themselves, little mindful of the dogma that denies free agency. It is chiefly when the Augustinian doctrines are held loosely and in the decline of devout fervor, that their mischief appears and practical fatalism begins and Antinomianism rages; as the grape torn from its stem, ferments and becomes the intoxicating wine. The Pelagian doctrines, when held earnestly, tend to invigorate the powers and to enforce Christian faith with something of stoical energy. But when held without much earnestness, they tend to great laxity, not indeed to fierce fanaticism, but to merely worldly decency, a morality without faith and a religion without prayer. It is some cause of congratulation, that neither class of doctrines has prevailed exclusively in the world, in the Catholic or Protestant churches, nor is likely so to prevail in time to come.

We leave speaking of the controversy between the African bishop and the British monk by quoting some anonymous lines, which presented themselves to us whilst writing upon this topic.

"To some, hath God his word addressed
'Mid symbols of his ire;
And made his presence manifest
In whirlwind, storm and fire;
Tracing with burning lines of flame
On trembling hearts his holy name.

To some, the solemn voice has spoken
In life's serene retreat;
Where on the still heart sounds have broken
As from the mercy-seat,
Swelling in the soft harmonies,
That float on evening's tranquil breeze."

In such diversity the word of God came to the two champions now passing before us. Let those throw at their monuments the first stone, who have had a deeper sense of Christian duty, or illustrated their faith by a purer or more devoted life.

It was happy for Augustine's fame that he undertook to write the City of God, sad as was the event that first inspired the work. It is unquestionably the noblest monument of thought and learning that Christian antiquity affords. It was written upon a subject which might have kindled the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets, while it demanded all the knowledge that philosophy, literature and divinity could afford. The position of Augustine and the ruling minds of his church bore great resemblance to that of the Hebrew prophets, who flourished in the declining days of the national glory. As then the Assyrians were pouring their barbaric hordes in torrents upon Judah and the civilized nations of the world, so now the Goths of the North were sending down their swarming hosts against the Christian empire, had already stormed the walls of Rome, and threatened the ruin of all that was fairest and holiest on earth. When Augustine embraced Christianity, the great Theodosius was upon the throne, soon united both empires under his sceptre, and had already made Orthodoxy the established faith of the realm. Now what a change! Rome in ruins, and none to avenge her destruction! The spirit of Paganism, so long crushed under imperial power, rose from the dust, and spoke of the days of Rome's primeval glory, before her energies had been broken by the tame creed and craven worship of the crucified Nazarene. The old philosophy allied itself with the old superstition, and both croaked like birds of ill omen in the fearful storm. The Pagan gods seemed to be avenging the desecration of their altars, and to threaten general ruin, unless their temples were rebuilt. At this time, immediately after the siege of Rome by Alaric, Augustine conceived the plan of his great work of vindicating the kingdom of Christ against the kingdoms of the world, Christian civilization against Pagan domination. Gibbon began his history when seated among the ruins of the capital, and "amused and exercised" nearly twenty years of his life by a history unsurpassed for its brilliant genius and for its perverse

spirit. The bishop of Hippo in his beautiful see upon the shore of the Mediterranean, surrounded by monuments of Roman greatness, as he heard of the first shock of the power that was to make of the Roman empire a ruin, conceived a sublimer work, and devoted nearly as many years to its completion, with a learning more vast, (considering his age,) with a mind more lofty, a spirit far more pure. He wrote not in the elegant ease of a Lausanne retirement, but in the midst of pressing cares. Viewed even from this present age, there is good reason to regard the work of the great Christian theologian of the fifth century as proving him a better student of mankind, a truer prophet of the future, than the great skeptical historian of the eighteenth century. His work was not on the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, but the Rise and Fall of Paganism and the rise and triumph of the City of God. It has justly been called "the funeral oration of the ancient society, the gratulatory panegyric on the birth of the new." The best historians of the nineteenth century honor the spirit and the views of Augustine more than those of Gibbon. Even in France, the land which Gibbon so admired, and which at his death he left so rife with infidelity, the leading historians rebuke the folly that would dismiss Christianity with a sneer; Michelet and Guizot, with a genius as brilliant and with a learning quite as extended as his, with a creed, too, quite as little tolerant of Jesuitical cunning and priestly arrogance, write of former ages with a reverence for religion that some have deemed too superstitious, and in their views of the stability of society and the foundations of human welfare, and the course of Divine Providence, agree far more with the author of the City of God than with the writer of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

In the second book of his Retractations Augustine thus speaks of the plan he had in view in writing his chief work, after having alluded to the circumstances which moved him to undertake the task.

"This great work upon the City of God is at last finished, in twenty-two books. The first five of which refute those who maintain that the worship of many gods, as held by the Pagans, is essential to the prosperity of human affairs, and who contend that calamities arise and abound when this worship is prohibited. The five following books are directed against those who grant

that these calamities never have failed and never will fail to happen to mortal men, and will vary in magnitude according to times, places and persons; but who still assert that the worship of many gods by sacrificial rites is of use in respect to the life beyond the grave. Thus in ten books these two idle opinions, so hostile to the Christian religion, are refuted. But lest we may be accused of attacking other persons while we advance nothing positive on our own part, the remaining twelve books are devoted to this purpose. Although wherever there is need, we assert our own views in the first ten, and refute our opponents in the last twelve books. Of these twelve books, the first four contain the origin of the two kingdoms, one of which is of God, the other of this world; the second four contain the course or progress of the two; the third and last four, the true issue of both. Thus although the twenty-two books are written upon both cities, yet they have taken their title from the better one, so that they are called, 'De Civitate Dei.'"

We follow the usual rendering of the name and call it City of God, although State or Kingdom of God would be a more appropriate title.

Such was the stupendous work to which Augustine gave the maturity of his years and the whole force of his talents and attainments. It is an attempt at a philosophy of history upon Christian principles. Some have compared it to Plato's Republic, and Schlegel has thought its plan to have been suggested by Plato's work. If so, the Christian shows no little advantage over the Greek. Both start from the highest principles of right in the abstract, but Plato utterly nullifies them by his absurd ideas of the community of women, equality of conditions, military education of women, death of unruly children, prohibition of private property, false distinctions of merit. Augustine, besides enforcing his lofty principles by divine sanctions, connects them with the Christian scheme of civilization, and, in spite of his gloomy dogmas and vain superstitions, advocates those great measures of civilized society, which prove indeed that "between the ancient and the modern world, the Gospel intervenes." Plato may have erred in the plan of his Republic* from lack of constructive power in carrying

* The writer is well aware that some commentators upon Plato have denied that the "Republic" of this philosopher was intended to be a political work, or to give an ideal of social organization. Neither Rousseau, nor Professor Taylor Lewis has been able to substantiate this theory.

out his transcendental ideas, but however this may be, he more lacked the great Christian facts, and his scheme hence falls far below that of the much less original genius now before us. But we must not continue this parallel, nor say more in detail of the City of God. In a word, the writer compares the Pagan with the Christian civilization, both in reference to this world and the world to come; he describes the moral abominations and deadly superstitions of Heathenism; strips off the mask from military glory; reveals the hollowness of Heathen philosophy; shows the power of Christianity in softening the very barbarians whose inroads were so alarming; and closes with a glowing description of the kingdom of God, or the true Church of the faithful, from its rise in Eden to its glorious consummation in the resurrection of the saints. The treatise is a noble one, not indeed without its defects, but far in advance of his age, and so far as true catholicity is concerned, far in advance of much of the theology of our own day. It seems to anticipate some of the results of modern science, as, for example, in the hints concerning the days of the creation. It seems to us altogether in advance of that formalism of our time, which limits the power of Christianity so entirely to an official priesthood and their rites. It shows no trace of Popery as a hierarchical despotism. Its author evidently little dreamed that, following out the policy of his master Ambrose, Leo and the two Gregories would make such a despotism of the City of God, and Hildebrand, Gregory VII., would lord it over God's people with more than a Cæsar's pride. Even comparing Augustine's work with that recent production that almost adopts its name, Maurice's "Kingdom of Christ," we must say, that much as we admire the ability and many of the ideas and sentiments of the latter, the tone of the English presbyter is altogether more hierarchical than that of the African bishop.

We can say no more of Augustine's works. We have chosen to speak of the three that best represent the different phases of his mind, and show him as the man, the theologian, the philosopher. We have not spoken of his sermons or his letters, both of which have been preserved in considerable numbers, because they are not essential to a knowledge of the writer's genius. His sermons are not remarkable for thought or eloquence, although those of

them that are occupied with expositions of Scripture, such as the Homilies on the Gospels, which fill a volume of the Oxford Library, shed much light on the common method of interpreting Scripture, and have considerable intrinsic value in spite of their allegorizing character. His letters deal more frequently with subjects than persons, and have not much of the epistolary charm, although there are exceptions.

The editions that we have consulted are probably the most important of the many that have appeared, and their very dates and editors are interesting and suggestive, whether we consider the edition of Erasmus, (1528–29,) the earliest that aimed to be complete, that of the Louvaine theologians, among whom Jansenius received his education and undoubtedly took his direction (1577,) or that of the Benedictines (1679–1700,) which now reappears in such beauty more than a century and a half after its first publication (1836–9.)

What shall we say of Augustine on the whole? Shall we dismiss his mighty name with common-place reflections on his superstitions, or vulgar sneers at his dogmas, or fulsome eulogies of his saintly holiness and infallible judgment? Not so. Let us try to view him fairly. He is not one of the men whom we have been in the habit of admiring. The more reason then for estimating him justly.

As to intellect, he evidently had great acuteness and great breadth. Had not his mind been so absorbed by his favorite doctrines of the total depravity and moral inability of man and the overwhelming power of God, and so inflamed, alike by personal experience and controversial opposition, with zeal for his peculiar creed, he might perhaps have ranked among the sages of philosophy, and the Church would have lost a theologian she could not well have spared. Bold systems of philosophy might have been constructed from some of his favorite ideas. The doctrine which Leroux, the "last word" of French philosophy, has set forth so vauntingly concerning the *solidarity* of the human race, and which a metaphysical neophyte of the Romish Church among us has declared to be the cause of his conversion and the basis of true divinity, is all implied in Augustine's dogma of the union of all men in Adam as the federal head. We are not sorry that he did not rest

in philosophic abstractions, prone to them though he was. Had he done thus, he would not have wielded the power needed in his age, for philosophical theories are very pliant, and starting from the same ideal theory, one man worships God in his own soul with dreamy reverie, whilst another adores the Eternal Spirit in rites and temples, thrones and priesthoods; and the most radical Democracy and uncompromising Popery wear the same transcendental hues, according as the mist-clouds rest upon the valley or wreath the mountain-top.

Yet we are glad that Augustine's faith was accompanied by such strong tendencies to philosophical views. Even under his devotional musings, we sometimes observe a tendency towards universal ideas and broad analogies, that remind us now of a Butler with his sober wisdom and now of a Swedenborg with his spiritual correspondencies. His intellect was eminently deductive more than inductive, more prone to trace principles to their conclusions than to observe facts with the view of bringing them within the range of principles. He was ready to carry out an idea wherever it would lead him, without due regard to collateral truths, and thus, as in his views of the doom of unbaptized children, his logic drove him to conclusions, from which his heart revolted. As a theologian of deductive intellect, he reminds us of his great disciple, Jonathan Edwards, whilst as uniting intellectual subtlety with devotional fervor, he resembles Richard Baxter, that most voluminous of writers and most disinterested of men. Yet Augustine shows much inductive power, especially in his survey of sacred science in his work on Christian doctrine, and in his view of civilization in the City of God. Reading these, one is at least reminded of the "Novum Organum" and the "Advancement of Learning," and may perhaps hesitate to call him the Bacon of an age rude in science and wanting in true method.

He was not destitute of imagination, but he rarely shows this in its common forms, because he dwelt so much in the region of general truths, that his imagination deals almost exclusively with them, and not with objects in the world of nature or of art, whether scenes, characters, or persons. Yet when reading his Confessions, as when reading Edwards's Diary, we almost say, here is a man who would have been a great poet had he not been a great theologian.

Practically he was a man of strong sense. As a bishop he ruled with great moderation, not stretching his prerogative far, but consulting the will of the majority in his official acts and careful to follow the customs of the church. He gave judicious advice to those who consulted him. His clergy asked him to advise them what to do upon the approach of the barbarians. Remain at your posts if your people remain, even if it be to die with them; leave your posts if your people leave, and do not vainly brave the pains of martyrdom; — was the spirit of his reply. Advocate as he was of celibacy and the retired life, he dissuaded the Roman General, Boniface, from renouncing the world and entering the monastery. Augustine advised him to serve God in his present vocation, and consecrate his military skill to the defence of Christendom against the barbarians. Perhaps this advice showed Augustine's knowledge of human nature, as well as his idea of duty. The Roman who was so agonized by the loss of his wife as to forswear the world, soon forgot his grief in another connection, and needed still sterner counsel from his adviser to keep him within the limits of morality, and afterwards to reclaim him from treason.

It is hard to estimate soberly a mind so entirely pervaded by enthusiastic feeling, a head of iron with a heart of flame. He was a man of great affections, engrossed by a prostrate reverence, tempered not a little sweetly by gentle charity. The crabbed Jerome did not provoke his anger, nor did his controversies with the Manicheans and Pelagians move him to forget the distinction between opinions and character, and to malign the men in opposing their doctrines. He was a strict moralist, and in advance of the common Jesuitism of his age, which permitted the use of falsehood for promoting the good of the Church and the glory of God.

As to force of will, he does not rank among the greatest of his order, except in reference to concentration of thought. In executive energy he falls below Ambrose, his spiritual father, and Luther and Knox, his spiritual children. He does not seem to have had great power in personal address, or great daring in professional enterprise. Thought rather than action was his domain. Hence perhaps the relative quiet of his latter years. He wrote a Treatise upon Preaching, — the last book of his work on the Christian Doctrine,

— and gives some anecdotes of the success of his own appeals. But his sermons, though carefully worded, are generally very short, and, as before hinted, common-place, and prove either his little gift for the pulpit, or else his low sense of the capacities of his audience. Even when treating such themes as his favorite Paul, he does not enter into the depths of his subject, nor speak as from the affluence of so profound an experience. Yet he was evidently an attentive pastor, earnest in his labors, very discreet, generally mild and charitable, and equally free from tame plodding and fanatical excess. Many deep thinkers have been indifferent preachers.

His writings give us many glimpses of his personal character, and he has made a full statement of his personal failings, which he classes under the three heads of the "lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." Under the first head, he confesses a leaning towards the pleasures of music and especially of the table, although we learn from Possidius, that he was quite abstemious and more generous to his guests than to himself; under the second, he allows that he has an over-curiosity in explaining things his own way, a tendency which few will dispute; under the third head, he accuses himself of some intellectual pride alike in his own labors and his view of God's works.

As to his way of life, the biography by Possidius is the best light, execrable as the Latinity is. The sketch there given would not be much out of the way, if transferred to our latitude and incorporated into the biography of some of our grave old Puritan divines, so far as manners and habits are concerned. One fact recorded, is quite amusing. Augustine was not fond of scandal, and declared his opposition to it in two Latin verses written upon his table; a circumstance which, with the alleged difficulty of enforcing his desires upon his clerical guests, proves that ministers were then mortal, and that a little gossip was not deemed unseasonable at every bishop's table. He insisted upon leaving the room if his wishes in this respect were violated, and sometimes did so and retired to his chamber. The lines alluded to were these: —

> "Quisquis amat dictis absentum rodere vitam,
> Hanc mensam indignam noverit esse sibi."

In plain English, "Whoever takes pleasure in abusing the absent, should know that this table is no place for him." His style of living was moderate, free from both extremes. He used wine sparingly, and did not, like many ascetics, renounce animal food. In dress he observed the same moderation.

In regard to Augustine's scholarship, Erasmus seems to us to give the best idea of it, in his preface to the edition of Basle, and in occasional letters. Augustine was evidently not so remarkable for finished scholarship as for extensive information and bold thought. He was little familiar with Greek, and not at all with Hebrew, and although well versed in Latin literature, he was far below Jerome as a master of Latin composition; as well he might be, born and educated as he was in a rude province, whilst Jerome received his culture in the bosom of Roman refinement. Erasmus says, that one page of Origen will tell him more of Greek philosophy than ten of Augustine. Yet Augustine was evidently acquainted with the leading productions of the Greek mind. He probably gained most of his knowledge from translations. He speaks much of Plato and with favor, less of Aristotle and with qualified praise; whilst of the great Alexandrian divines, Clement and Origen, he says, we believe, nothing of the former, and of the latter nothing that is laudatory. Still through his master Ambrose, he felt more of the force of the great Origen's Platonizing theology than he was aware of or willing to confess. When we say that he was ready at extempore speaking, and many of his published writings were taken down from *viva voce* addresses, we ascribe to him an important talent, and give a reason for judging charitably the harshness of some of his pages as to style.

In reference to the question at issue between the Oxford party and the Evangelicals in the present controversy regarding the Fathers, the position of Augustine is somewhat equivocal. Both claim him in the main, and both are afraid of something in his ways. The Churchman is afraid of his Puritan doctrines of sin and conversion; the Evangelical is afraid of his superstitious formalism: whilst the one praises his faithful Churchmanship, and the other his strict Evangelism. The works referred to in our former article show this mingled feeling. Taylor lauds Augustine's essen-

tial doctrines, and condemns his superstitious forms. Unlike Joseph Milner, who thinks Augustine the true light of a dark age, Taylor regards him as having given his influence to the worst practises of priestcraft, such as celibacy, saint-worship, purgatory, relics, and the whole train of similar abominations. We are perfectly ready to agree with Mr. Taylor as to the effect of the Nicene ideas of woman and celibacy in promoting a morbid creed, temper and ritual. Augustine himself, as Possidius and his own writings declare, held very extreme views regarding married life, and was very reluctant to mingle at all in female society. Had he associated more with women and children, or known the discipline of a true home, some features of his theology might have been spared the world. But Mr. Taylor probably refers to other points than ourselves in his censures.

These are strange words for a champion of modern Calvinism to apply to the great progenitor of his creed: —

"Augustine, the hope, the *last* hope of his times, joined hands with the besotted bigots around him, who would listen to no reproofs; he raised his voice among the most intemperate to drown remonstrance. Superstition and spiritual despotism, illusion, knavery, and abject formalism, received a new warrant from the high seat of influence which he occupied; the church drove its chariot with mad haste down the steep, and thenceforward nothing marks its history but blasphemy, idolatry and blood! The popery which even now is gathering over our heavens in all quarters, is little else than the digested superstition which the good Augustine set forward in his day."

These words are undoubtedly true so far as they refer to errors and superstitions embedded in Augustine's works, and which might be made to palliate results like those specified, but the passage cited is not fair as an exposition of Augustine's own spirit and tendency. He was surrounded by formal superstitions, and approved not a few evil customs, but these had not mastered his own soul. Unconsciously perhaps to Augustine, the great conflict was going on in his mind, which was afterwards to be waged so fiercely and with such various results — the controversy still going on between faith and formalism — "an eagle and a serpent wreathed in fight." In his soul, the eagle had not lost the mastery.

"A shaft of light upon its wings descended,
And every golden feather gleamed therein —
Feather and scale inextricably blended.
The serpent's mail'd and many-colored skin
Shone through the plumes its coils were twined within
By many a swoln and knotted fold, and high
And far, the neck, receding lithe and thin,
Sustained a crested head, which warily
Shifted and glanced before the eagle's steadfast eye."

Whether eagle or serpent shall finally conquer, Mr. Taylor of course believes, will be decided by the issue of the present controversy.

The Oxford scholars are careful, evidently, not to select Augustine's more decided predestinarian works for the press. They show their estimate of him by printing his Confessions and Homilies. We prefer to give their judgment of his worth in these lines from Williams's "Cathedral," to extracting any passages from their prefaces or notes. The sonnet is no bad summary of the life portrayed.

"As when the sun hath climbed a cloudy mass,
And looks at noon on some cathedral dim,
Each limb, each fold in the translucent glass
Breaks into hues of radiant seraphim;

So, sainted Bishop! in the lettered stone
Which still enfolds thy spirit, fled from sight,
Comment, Prayer, Homily, or learned lore,
Christ bathes each part with his transforming light

Late risen in thee. Thence all is eloquent
With flowing sweetness; o'er each rising pause
Thou buildst in untired strength; through all is sent
The word, pleading for his most righteous laws.

For thy sick soul, by baptism's seal relieved,
Deep in her brackish founts the healing Cross received."

We must deal more gently than otherwise with the last two lines, since Augustine himself was an advocate of baptismal regeneration. Evidently neither Evangelicals nor High-churchmen can make the ancient saint wholly subservient to their minds.

Not a few of our readers will not regret the inability of either party to make sectarian capital of so great a name, and will be more eager to learn the lessons taught by his life. They will require little aid to lead them to appreciate the double lesson conveyed; — the danger of allowing one favorite notion to master the mind, and of suffering the pride of logical consistency to enslave the intuitions of the reason, the undefinable instincts of our moral nature, to any abstract formula, whether of philosophy or theology; on the other hand, the power of a strong faith in the revealed God, the peace of a soul assured of forgiveness, resting in the Divine will, and giving all its energies to the good of man and the advancement of the Divine kingdom. Herein was thy chief glory, Augustine, heart of flame! an absorbing faith and love, born of a deep personal experience, and never quenched or eclipsed by strifes, dogmas or forms. Burn and shine forever in that golden candle-stick in which not one church, but all Christians have exalted thy memory!

Divide the strong minds of Christendom into four chief classes, according to their affinity with the leading Apostles, and the principal tendencies of religion, — with Peter in his ecclesiastical zeal, John in his devout contemplation, James with his ethical exactness, and Paul, the late convert, with his dialectical force and systematic divinity; Augustine deserves a rank next to Paul among the dialecticians of the Church. Next to the Apostle of the Gentiles, he is leader of the illustrious band, who have meditated on sin and its remedy with the power of great intellect and the riches of deep experience, until their very logic has burned with eloquence and they have become the chief apostles of the doctrines most mighty in conversion. He is not of the stamp of Cyprian and Ambrose and Hildebrand, nor of Origen and Chrysostom and Fenelon, nor of Pelagius and Butler and Paley; it is enough to say, that as a thinker he leads in the path where Calvin, Pascal, Leighton, Edwards, Chalmers have followed, whilst in respect to Christian experience he stands foremost among the Luthers and Bunyans of the Church. S. O.

ART. IV. — RETRIBUTION.

WE are continually reaping the fruits of our past character and conduct, and we are continually sowing seeds, which in the following periods of our lives will bring forth sweet or bitter fruits. Each successive portion of life is intimately connected with all that have gone before it, and with all that will come after it. The present is what the past has made it, and, according as it is well or ill used, will essentially modify the future. Neglected youth is followed by manhood without respectability, and wasted manhood by an old age of unhonored want. Dishonesty sooner or later brings forth the fruits of shame. Idleness results in poverty. Intemperance and debauchery lead to disease and pain, and end in premature decay and death.

This, we have reason to believe, is a universal law of God's moral government. It operates in the future life, as well as in the present. As the different stages of our mortal existence are indissolubly connected with each other, so is the life to come connected with this. This life is designed to be a preparation for that. As we have sowed here, we shall reap there. We shall experience there an exact and righteous retribution of our faithfulness or unfaithfulness here. This doctrine, the doctrine of future retribution, we propose briefly to illustrate and defend in the present article. It is going back, indeed, to the primary elements of our religion, but it is always well to recur to first principles. It may not be unprofitable to consider in what manner this truth is developed in the Gospel, and also to look at some of the consequences that follow from a denial of it, — in what light such a denial places this life and the life to come, in what light it places our responsibilities as immortal beings.

It is impossible, we conceive, to read the New Testament with an ordinary degree of attention, without perceiving that it promises eternal life on certain conditions. This fact necessarily implies, that eternal life will not be bestowed without a fulfilment of those conditions. Nothing can be more discordant from the prevalent tone of the Gospel on this subject, than the assertion, that the great blessing it was designed to bestow upon men, will be con-

ferred upon them without any agency or cooperation of their own; that its object is, to make men happy in spite of themselves. It is uniformly represented, that heaven is to be sought, to be striven for, to be won. It is the reward of care, forethought, watchfulness, endeavor. It is the result of a character and a life. It is said, that it may be lost; that there is danger of exclusion from it. We will cite a few specimens of this general tenor of the Gospel. We find some of them in the first discourse of our Lord that occurs in the New Testament, the Sermon on the Mount. We are there admonished, for example, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Here a figure is borrowed from the care and labor with which men are accustomed to make provision for the future of the present life. Does it not imply, that at least equal endeavor is necessary to secure our well-being in the life to come? Is any encouragement held out to the expectation, that men will find treasures laid up for them in heaven, whether they have taken any pains to lay them up for themselves or not? In the same discourse Jesus says, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." Here active obedience to the will of God, is represented as the condition of admission to Christ's kingdom. And a little farther on, we find expressly asserted, what, indeed, is necessarily implied in the words just quoted, that failure to comply with that condition will work exclusion from the kingdom; to those who have rendered him a mere lip-service, without true obedience, he will say, "I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." And in the conclusion of that discourse, the man who rests his hope on any other foundation than obedience to the words of Christ, is compared to a man who built upon the sand, and whose house was overturned and ruined. In the parable by which the retribution that takes place under the Gospel dispensation is illustrated, the servants who had faithfully improved the talents committed to their trust, received high rewards, whilst the slothful servant, who had neglected to increase

the one talent committed to him, was punished by exclusion from his master's presence. In a declaration of the principles on which judgment will be passed on those who stand before the tribunal of Christ, it is said, that they who have performed deeds of mercy and charity will be approved, whilst those who have neglected to relieve the poor and suffering will receive the sentence of condemnation.

These are a few specimens, merely, of the manner in which the New Testament speaks of the terms on which men may share the blessings of that kingdom, which commences on earth, and extends into the world to come. It is the righteous, who "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." It is to the pure in heart that the promise is made, that "they shall see God." Without holiness no man can see him, either in this life, or in the future. Jesus also spoke expressly of a retribution to take place in the world to come, of a judgment to be passed after death. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, he lifts the mysterious veil that separates the two worlds, and gives us a glimpse of the spiritual state. That glimpse reveals it as a state of retribution. The rich man is there represented as suffering the consequences of his luxurious, sensual, selfish life, of his abuse of wealth, and neglect of the means and opportunities of usefulness that it placed in his hands; and the beggar, as resting from his sorrows, and enjoying the rewards of his faith and patience. This is the obvious and plain meaning of the passage, and it is a hard task for ingenuity to torture it into any other. That it illustrates the subject of retribution, who can doubt? But retribution when and where? That measure of retribution that takes place in the present life? Our Lord frequently drew comparisons from the common occurrences of life, to illustrate subjects connected with the spiritual world; but that he should, in this single case, have reversed the process, and should have borrowed from the shadowy region beyond the grave, and from a popular opinion of punishment there, which, by supposition, would be false, images by which to make more clear what was daily passing before men's eyes, is altogether incredible. The only rational explanation of the passage is, that it discloses to us the spiritual world; and it teaches, that there is suffering in that world for sin. Jesus again asserted this truth in express terms, when he

uttered those solemn words, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

That nothing impure can enter into the kingdom of God, that happiness depends on character, that the sinner never can be truly happy so long as he continues to be a sinner, and that this is a fixed law of our moral nature, and takes effect in every stage of our being, the future as well as the present, is a truth too plain to be denied; and we believe it never has been denied. If, then, there be no suffering in the future life for the sins of this, if all men, of every variety of character formed in this life, pass immediately into an equal degree of happiness in the next, it must be, because the characters of those who have lived in sin and neglect, are changed by the mere process of death; and we must suppose it possible, that a man may sink to sleep in this world, steeped in moral pollution, and wake in the next, a perfectly pure and holy being. Is this probable? Does reason or Scripture afford any ground for such a supposition? How can death be supposed to possess this mighty moral power? It is a mere physical event. It is the dropping away, from around the spirit, of the mortal coil that here environs it. The soul passes into the spiritual world; passes as it is, with the character it has formed. Character is an attribute of the soul, not of the body, and cannot be laid aside with the body. If by a long life of sensuality, of sordid or reckless passion, of worldliness and selfishness, that soul have contracted weakness, degradation and pollution, it is contrary to all that we are most deeply and certainly conscious of, respecting our moral and spiritual nature, to imagine that all those consequences of an evil life can be undone in an instant, and the soul be at once prepared for spiritual employments and pleasures. Surely its first experience in that world must be that of acute suffering for its abused and perverted powers. If it ever can be restored to holiness and happiness, it can only be through the agonies of remorse, and the protracted pains and toils of reformation.

No one, we repeat, denies that happiness depends on character. It is a fact,—and we may see abundant

illustration of it in this world, though the experience of the present life is not long enough to afford a complete verification of it, — that God has established an indissoluble connection between holiness and happiness, and between sin and misery. It is also a fact, in testimony of which we appeal to universal consciousness, that character must be self-acquired. It cannot be put upon a man, without his own agency. We do not forget the necessity of Divine aid. We hold a high doctrine on that subject. But we say, that it is only an aid, and not a substitute. It is a help to those only, who will help themselves. The acquisition of a holy character must ultimately be a man's own work. It is idle to speak of sin being put off, and righteousness put on, as the squalid rags of the Prodigal were taken away, and the best robe put upon him. And the attainment of exalted religious character is a slow and gradual process. The desire, the purpose, of seeking it may, indeed, be suddenly formed, and be a source of a certain measure of peace and satisfaction. But that is only a beginning. The consummation, especially after the spiritual powers have been impaired by long habits of sin, is a long, laborious, difficult work. These facts are in direct opposition to the idea, that there is anything in the mere event of death, to work a complete and radical change of character. And apart from these considerations, what, on the supposition that the Gospel does not teach future retribution, is its message to men? It says to them, 'Be pure and righteous; love God and man; if you have sinned, repent, reform and live a righteous life. This is the work given you to do; and if you do it not, — it is of no great consequence; it may make some difference here, but it will make none hereafter. If you do it not for yourself, death will do it for you.' Is this the appeal of the Gospel to the hearts of men? Is this a voice to arouse a world lying in wickedness?

A denial of retribution in the future state almost entirely cuts off the connection between the two stages of our existence, and leaves the present without a purpose. Many of the mysteries of the present life are solved, by supposing it to be the beginning of a scheme of discipline and education, which is to be consummated hereafter. Sorrow and suffering can be accounted for, by considering them as

means of purifying the soul and preparing it for a higher state of being. The successes of the wicked, and the losses and disappointments of the good, cease to perplex us, when we look forward to a state of righteous retribution, in which these seemingly unequal allotments will be adjusted. But take away the idea of future retribution, and we are deprived of this explanation. This life becomes an insolvable enigma. Suffering, which can no longer be regarded as a preparation for a state of being, which will be the same, whether it is prepared for or not, assumes the shape of gratuitous cruelty; and retribution, which, on this supposition, should be completed and made obvious within the compass of this mortal life, is not what we should expect from a righteous Judge. If all men, without respect to their character and conduct in this life, commence their future being from precisely the same starting-point, there is no reason why they should have been placed in this world at all.

One great source of the elevating and ennobling influence of the Gospel upon the soul of man, is the revelation of immortality. Suppose a living faith in that truth to be suddenly imparted to one who had never conceived it before, and how instantaneously is he changed in his own eyes. With what dignity and glory does he feel himself at once invested. He is no longer the creature of a day. He is no longer bound to the fleeting vanities and transient interests of earth. Death has no more power over him. He is an immortal being. Glorious hopes are opened before him. Solemn responsibilities are laid upon him. A great work is given him to do. If motive, opportunity, a wide and long career of action, have any power to exalt, expand and quicken the soul of man and inspire lofty purposes, what so suited to produce this effect, as the felt realities of the eternal world? But this "power of an endless life" depends on the connection of that life with the present; on the conviction, that what we do here will affect our condition there. Deny this connection, and the greater part of our interest in the doctrine of immortality is destroyed. It affords us an expectation of a future good, indeed; but it is not an inspiring hope, because we can do nothing to realize it. It lays upon us no care or responsibility, for our destiny will be accomplished, with or without our own efforts. The best that can be said of it is, that it

imparts the lazy comfort of an agreeable fatalism. So far as motive to noble action is concerned, it might as well not have been revealed.

Moreover, the exclusion of the idea of retribution from our view of the future life, must deprive us of some of the grounds on which men may be most effectually urged to the practice of virtue. What ground is left? The native beauty, excellence and desirableness of virtue, and that measure of good with which it is ordinarily rewarded in the present life; — the same ground, except that the Christian has the means of gaining a far nobler conception of what virtue is, that was occupied by the moral teachers of Heathen antiquity. To the first of these grounds we would do full justice. We believe that much can be effected by a true and strong appeal to men's moral instincts. We are far from thinking that all goodness, or the highest goodness, is the mere offspring of hope and fear. But the fear of the Lord, if not the consummation, is often "the beginning of wisdom." A man may have become so degraded by long continuance in sin, that all access to his heart may be barred, except through the avenue of fear. His moral perception may be so blinded by evil habit, or so dazzled and bewildered by the intoxications of appetite and passion, as to be unable to see any beauty in virtue, that he should desire it. Besides, even if the loveliness and excellence of virtue are fully acknowledged, still the attainment of it costs arduous and patient effort, and temptations to remit that effort are continually presented by the lower propensities and desires; and if man is told, that virtue, with its consequent happiness, certainly awaits him at no very distant crisis of his being, is it not to be expected, from all that we know of human nature, that he will seize the present gratification, and be willing to wait for the virtue that will soon be his without a struggle? Suppose a youth, in answer to an appeal made to him on the ground we are considering, should say, — 'The world and sense offer me the most glowing enjoyments, the most intense gratifications, which really seem to me the highest good I can possess, while the charms of virtue, of which you speak, look to me dim, cold, and undesirable. I choose the pleasures of sin, and will take my chance of the evil consequences which sometimes follow them, in the present

life. I am willing to run that risk, for the sake of the prize I may win; and if I am unlucky, it will soon be over, and I shall enter on that perfect happiness, which, you tell me, I cannot escape.' What, we ask, could be replied to him?

If there is no retribution in the future life, there is no perfect retribution at all; for such retribution does not take place in this world. Actual suffering and happiness are not exactly proportioned to good and ill desert. Unquestionably it is true, in general, that the religious man, the pure, benevolent, devout man, enjoys this life more highly than the man of an opposite character. There is nothing in his religion, to prevent his deriving from the good things of this life the greatest enjoyment they are capable of yielding. Besides these, he has his peculiar sources of happiness, and under the sufferings incident alike to all, he has a support and consolation that the irreligious man knows not of. The irreligious man loses this enjoyment. But the loss causes him no actual suffering. He is unconscious of it. He does not believe it, when you tell him of it. He will live and die in ignorance of it, and will never really feel it, unless he awake to a painful consciousness of it in the spiritual world, by finding himself unprepared for the occupations and pleasures of that world, by discovering that the whole of his busy life has been a laborious disqualification for the state upon which he has entered. We have said, that the superior happiness of the religious man is the ordinary rule. In order that temporal retribution should be perfect, the rule should be without exception. If there be a single exception, a wrong is done to the individual in whose case it occurs. But there are such exceptions. Eminently holy and devout men, from some infelicity of temperament, or unfortunate bias of opinion, have passed a wretched life, with the distressing apprehension that they were under the curse of God; and thus their religion was, in this life, to them a perpetual source of unhappiness. The reproaches of conscience are often in inverse proportion to guilt. The habitually conscientious man, who is tenderly alive to the smallest departure from rectitude, suffers a poignant anguish from the commission of a trifling offence; whilst the habitual violator of God's law, who has hardened his heart against the admonitions of conscience, or silenced

its voice by neglect, may daily commit flagrant transgressions without uneasiness. It is a familiar fact, that by persevering disregard of conscience a man can, if he will, relieve himself from its stings. There is something appalling in this ominous silence of conscience, on the supposition that, in the world to come, she will reassert her authority in stern and awful accents; but if her jurisdiction is confined to this life, if in the present world we hear the last of her voice, it must be confessed that she bears the sword in vain; she is incompetent to her office; she fails of dispensing the even justice for which she sits in the judgment-seat of the soul.

If we look at the outward retributions of goodness and wickedness, we find yet greater inequalities. The sensualist sometimes revels in every species of criminal indulgence, and, by the natural strength of his constitution, escapes the disease and suffering that are the usual consequences, and thus enjoys the gratifications of sin without paying their temporal penalty. The dishonest man may, by the excess of his cunning, contrive to maintain a fair show in the eyes of the world; or, by the excess of his shamelessness, he may outbrave the opinion of men, and find satisfaction in his ill-gotten wealth, without feeling as a punishment the finger of scorn that is pointed at him. But suppose all the outward, and all the inward, shame and misery that are ever visited upon transgression in this life, to be the sinner's portion; still, the "bold bad man" holds in his own hands the duration of his punishment. He may escape from it when he will. He can step, at any moment, into a state of unspeakable happiness. Yes, Judas the traitor, — after betraying, for a miserable pittance, the innocent blood of his blessed Master, — wrung by the agonies of remorse, taunted and scoffed by his base employers, goes out and hangs himself, and so passes to his everlasting joy and rest; while his fellow-disciples have many a weary year to spend in the faithful prosecution of their arduous mission, before a fiery martyrdom shall introduce them to the same blissful state.

There is danger of miscalculating the goodness of God. He is indeed good, merciful, gracious; he is love itself. He is also a holy and righteous being. His highest love, his approbation, his complacent regard can be bestowed

only on goodness, and goodness is the fruit of faithful endeavor and diligent self-cultivation. Glory, honor and immortality are declared to be the reward of those, who seek them "by patient continuance in well-doing." All the promises of God are to be understood as addressed to those, who place themselves in an attitude of obedience and conformity to his will. He is continually holding out to man his supreme good, and urging him, by all the persuasions of infinite love, to come and take it. Man may at any time receive it, and retain it forever. If he wander from it, there is no obstacle to his return but his own perverseness. But the love of God bears no resemblance to the injudicious fondness of a weak parent. He will not make men happy irrespectively of character. He will not force goodness upon them. They can, if they will, despise his offers, and persist in rebellion to his will, and no miraculous hand will be stretched out to save them, in spite of themselves, from the lot they have chosen. C. P.

Art. V. — BRIGGS'S DISCOURSES.*

It is unusual, and may be deemed incompatible with a severely correct taste, to affix to a volume of sermons an inscription so fanciful as that which Mr. Briggs has chosen. The book, however, as we are informed, was thought to require some title, descriptive of the general character of its contents — for all the discourses have an affinity of sentiment and purpose. To find a suitable name, sufficiently concise, and at the same time comprehensive, was a task of some difficulty. Several that suggested themselves as appropriate had been pre-occupied. The beautiful volume of Greenwood, on kindred topics, had already obtained a wide and affectionate welcome, under the simple appellation, "Sermons of Consolation;" and other favorite companions of the Christian in the closet and the chamber of

* *The Bow in the Cloud: Fifteen Discourses.* By George Ware Briggs, Junior Minister of the First Church in Plymouth, Mass. Boston: J. Dowe. 1846. 12mo. pp. 216.

mourning, had associated themselves with familiar names, which it would have been unbecoming to have borrowed.

In this dilemma, the present title — which had previously been adopted for the third of the Discourses, now entitled "The Sign of Promise" — was recommended to the author, as, upon the whole, the most significant, simple and attractive, that could be obtained for the book itself. If a plainer could have been found, it would have suited us better. But if only an emblematical title would answer, it would not be easy to select another more characteristic, or less objectionable, than "The Bow in the Cloud."

It suggests, at once, the nature of the topics treated in the Discourses, and the character of the views and sentiments presented in them. It leads the reader to look for representations of life's vicissitudes and trials, relieved by bright pictures of the "sweet uses of adversity," and the triumphs of Christian virtue. It points to the cloudy background of sorrow, illumined and spanned with the arc of promise. It prepares us to meditate on death, and bereavement, and blighted hopes, in connexion with the precious consolations of faith, and cheering assurances of immortality. It promises an exposition, so far as the author's experience and reflection may qualify him to give it, of the sublime Christian doctrines, that God chasteneth in love, and that they who mourn are blessed.

These subjects, which are suggested by the title, and which, certainly, are amongst the most interesting and important that come within the range of the pulpit, are discussed by Mr. Briggs with more than ordinary ability and spirit. We feel, at once, on opening the volume, that we are brought into contact with an earnest mind and a glowing heart, — with a mind that thinks for itself, and a heart that has deeply felt, alike the chastisement of sorrow and the healing power of Christian faith. We are wearied with no dulness; we are vexed with nothing commonplace. The current of thought is invariably full and rapid; running on from the beginning to the end of each sermon with unexhausted strength, and bearing us along with it, without any sense of fatigue, or any suspension of interest. Nothing like artificial method is apparent; although there is no confusion, nor incoherency of thought. The writer has, manifestly, bestowed no study upon the arrangement

of his ideas; nor sought the help which may be derived from a formal division; but has, rather, allowed a full mind and heart to pour out their thoughts and feelings, in a natural order and sequence, and with the unity that necessarily results from a strong and warm conception of the distinct subject to be unfolded, and the specific impression to be produced.

Judged, however, by the standard rules for the composition of sermons, and analyzed by an exact criticism, the volume is not without defects. When tested, as works of art, by comparison with the most approved models in their department, these Discourses are by no means perfect. In saying this, however, we would not be understood as considering the sermons before us to be open to severer criticism than many others, which hold a high rank in the catalogue of publications of this sort, and which obtain a wide circulation. On the contrary, it is our opinion that there are few volumes of religious discourses which possess a greater variety of merit, or exhibit more decided marks of genius. All we mean is, to express an exalted estimate of the master-pieces of the great art in question. We do not intend to depreciate "The Bow in the Cloud," but to do justice to our idea of a perfect sermon. We would never suffer this idea to be lowered, either in thought or in word. We would let slip no favorable opportunity of elevating it. We would allow no friendly feelings, no personal considerations, to prevent us from exalting it by contrast, or making it clearer by candid criticism. At whatever cost, *that* must never, for one instant, be clouded, never, in the least degree, be let down.

Our hope for the influence and advancement of the pulpit is dependent, in no small measure, upon this very thing. Let the preacher keep in view, in the composition of his sermons — at least, of those which are intended for publication — the most faultless models. Let him regard sermon-writing as an art, one of the highest arts. Let him do full justice to it, at least in his idea. Let him consider it as inferior to no other. Let him feel that it demands the exertion of all his highest faculties; that it affords scope for all his genius, all his study, all his knowledge, all his taste; for the play of imagination; for the expression of the most delicate shades of sentiment; for the

exhibition of the utmost artistical skill. This is the true view of it, whatever men in general may say. Whatever crude notions may prevail, or however poorly it may be exemplified in the practice of the clerical profession itself, this is the true view of it. At least it should be the preacher's own view.

It is not to be disputed, indeed, that there is some foundation for the common prejudice against sermons, — that they are proverbial for dulness. We allow that there is some justification of the contemptuous remark, which is so often heard — and which is made as if men felt it a peculiar pleasure, and thought it an indication of superior sense, to decry this class of writings — "O, we never read sermons." Nor can we wonder, or complain, that so many volumes in this department of composition are rotting in garrets, and on the shelves of old libraries, whose contents are explored only by the moth and the worm. Although we have not a doubt, that there might oftentimes be found within those unopened covers, labeled with their unpromising titles, not only the fruits of deep reflection, of large experience, of superior wisdom, of profound and varied knowledge, not only the fragrant memorials of a sublime piety and an unfeigned benevolence; but also fragments, at least, of the highest eloquence, fair specimens of a pure and noble style, and many passages, which if they were brought into the light, and the unmerited stigma of their origin were concealed, would be universally admired by men of taste, and receive even from logicians and rhetoricians the highest meed of praise.

Besides, we are not willing to allow it to be a fact, that the stupidity and anility of former ages have embalmed themselves, so much more frequently and largely than elsewhere, in those "dumpy little quartos" entitled Sermons, which are packed away in unexplored alcoves of public libraries, like ranges of mummy cases in dark catacombs. Nor do we regard it as by any means so clearly demonstrated, as to be admitted without discussion, that there may not be found, in proportion to their respective quantities, quite as much (and even more) of dry, and unprofitable reading in every other branch of literature, as in this. Moreover, we have often thought that many of those youths and maidens who scout and hide the volumes of Sermons,

which their fathers and mothers loved and reverenced — whilst they gathered from them food for their sweetest meditations and strength for their worthiest toils — have sometimes rejected therewith more wholesome, aye, and more savory fare for mind and heart, than could be found, after long searching, in whole heaps of the ornamented trash that commands the modern market.

But however this may be, it should be regarded by the preacher himself as a point of professional honor, a principle of professional duty, to countenance no injustice, from whatever source it may be offered; to admit no insult, by whatever authority it may be sanctioned; to smile at no superficial sneers, however popular, directed against either his peculiar department of literary art, or the collective works of his predecessors and his contemporaries, who have cultivated, and are exercising it. He knows, or he ought to know — whatever he can do himself — that there is no species of composition, which admits of more grandeur, impressiveness, and beauty, than the sermon; or which can occupy a higher rank. He knows that there is nothing inherent in the nature of the themes which it discusses, or in the canons which regulate and control their treatment, that necessarily renders the sermon uninteresting, heavy, dry, or inelegant. He knows that its subjects are the most interesting and sublime that can occupy the thought, or inspire the pen of man; — that all the heart, and all the life, all the inner and the outer world of humanity; the wide realm of nature; the whole circle of the sciences; the crowded history of the past; the perfections, revelations, laws and operations of God; the miraculous manifestation of the Deity in Christ; with all the spiritual glories and moral charms of the character of Jesus; all that is lovely and wonderful in his life, and venerable and heart-moving in his death, and consolatory and inspiriting in his resurrection and his promises; heaven and hell; time and eternity; that all these, and whatever else affects the interests, or concerns the destiny, or occupies the profoundest thoughts, or kindles the highest imaginings, or stirs the deepest affections of man, come within the range of the pulpit, and may be made tributary to the interest, the instructiveness, the splendor, the majesty, and the power of the sermon. He knows, moreover, or he ought to know,

that — although no preacher among the living, or the dead, has reached the highest conceivable point of excellence in this species of composition — there have been many, in every age of the Church, even amongst those whose works are, through ignorance, set aside as unreadable and included in the sweeping condemnation of dulness, who have discoursed eloquently, and reasoned profoundly, and written beautifully, and whose literary merits, to speak of no other claims, are not a whit inferior to those of the best scholars and writers of the periods which they have enlightened and adorned.

All this the modern preacher knows, or ought to know. If he does not know it, he can have little, very little professional spirit. He has a most unworthy conception of the dignity and power, the reach and the claims of the sermon. Nor can he have conversed with those divines of old, whom to read is to admire, to understand is to be wise, to equal is to be great, and to excel will task, to the utmost, the energies of the most studious and the most gifted mind. All this he knows. And with such knowledge, he cannot think meanly of his peculiar department of art. He cannot listen, unmoved, to the shallow, wholesale sneers of those, with whom it is the fashion complacently to ridicule a whole class of writings, of whose real merits they are incompetent to judge, and concerning the individual portions of which, with but few exceptions, they are utterly ignorant. And, moreover, what he may, from necessity, fail to do in his own practice, he will never forbear to attempt to do by the free expression of his earnest convictions, — to secure for the sermon its just and legitimate literary rank.

Entertaining these opinions, it is certainly an evidence of the high esteem in which we hold the Discourses of Mr. Briggs, that they tempt us to compare them with the best models. There are innumerable sermons, in regard to which it would be almost ridiculous to institute such a comparison. They have their merits and their defects; but they are, obviously, so far below the highest standard of criticism, that one would never think of applying it to them. We pass judgment upon them *per se*; or we measure them with others of their own cast, and which are somewhere near their own level. But the sermons before

us come near enough to those which occupy the first rank, to be estimated by the same rules. In several particulars they will compare honorably with the best. Few are their superiors in freshness, elevation and delicacy of sentiment, in earnestness, animation and fluency of style, in freedom and fervor of thought. Few are more impregnated with the spirit of a cheerful and affectionate piety.

But in all respects we cannot commend them so highly. Their style appears somewhat deficient in dignity, accuracy, and purity — those solid graces of the written sermon — the prominent characteristics of those of Buckminster and Channing. Their earnestness is a little too impassioned, exclamatory and unvaried. It might be equally as profound and impressive with a calmer movement, or if its fervent expression were occasionally intermitted. As an illustration of the reality of the defect to which we here allude, it may not be deemed too trifling to mention the fact, that, being struck with the frequency of the occurrence of the interjection ah! we were led to count the number of times it appeared in the sermon which we were then reading, and found it to be no less than eleven. A fervid utterance is natural to glowing thought, and both are immeasurably preferable to tameness and coldness. But when we turn over page after page, and find in every sermon, and in each separate sermon from beginning to end, scarce any perceptible variation of the temperature of thought; when nearly every paragraph, from the exordium to the peroration, appears to have been written under an equal excitement; when we discover no gradual kindling and no temporary lulls of emotion; no letting down, no unstraining of feeling; — though we may admire the ardor that can sustain itself so long and so well, though we may wonder at the fervor which is capable of protracting so elevated a strain, we cannot but sigh for an occasional change of modulation, and feel the want of more frequent opportunities of comparative repose.

We have been somewhat similarly affected by the splendid sermons of Martineau, entitled, "Endeavors after the Christian Life." While reading them, we feel as if we must often pause and take breath. Replete as they are with profound thoughts and resplendent with genius, we miss in them that grandeur which would have been

imparted to them by greater simplicity. If they had been less highly wrought, they would have been more dignified, impressive and truly beautiful. The same impression was, to a less extent, produced by the first sermons of Dr. Dewey; whose more recent discourses, with no diminution of fervor, have gained, essentially, in variety, purity and strength of style.

There appears, among some writers of the present day, to be a dread of nothing so much as of simplicity of language and sedateness of style. They mistake intellectual excitement, for intellectual power; ardor of imagination, for energy of thought; intenseness, for genius; what is extraordinary, for what is original and profound; that which is striking, for that which is effective; that which is highly wrought, for that which is really beautiful. Truth in a plain garb seems to them mere commonplace; and thought proceeding with sobriety of movement, is synonymous with dulness. We do not intend to apply this censure to the author of "The Bow in the Cloud," or to either of the distinguished writers whom we have named; although we will honestly say, that there is something in the style of Mr. Briggs, that has reminded us of the fault to which we refer. His sermons appear to us a little more highly colored than is consistent with a perfectly pure taste. They strike us as being somewhat too sentimental. They would please us more, with more manly directness. They abound in metaphors; which are in most instances appropriate and beautiful, but occasionally faulty; as, for example, in the following sentence. "The festival is kept, when the *consoling hand of the doctrine* it impresses is not only wiping away the tears of bereavement from weeping eyes, but when its sanctifying influence is transforming human hearts." It would be a stretch of his license in a poet, to employ such a figure as this. We cannot think it allowable in prose; or, if the writer considered it lawful and necessary to use so bold a metaphor, he should, at least, have been careful to relieve its singularity and correct the construction of the sentence, by giving a different position to the words "not only," which, as they stand, lead us to look, in vain, for some other operation of the hand besides wiping away the tears. We are happy to say, however, that such instances

as this are extremely rare, amidst a profusion of tropical expressions and similies, with which the most exact taste could find no fault.

We have already made the remark, that the style of these discourses is not altogether accurate; and, therefore, (as we have a strong dislike for all wholesale criticisms — often really unjust, and always exposed to the suspicion of being so,) we deem it imperative upon us, in this connexion, to substantiate its correctness. We will specify, particularly, two grammatical inaccuracies, which occur more frequently than we should have expected in compositions possessing, in other respects, so much merit.

One of these is the omission of the relative pronoun, in cases where its use is indispensable to a correct construction, and almost to the clear understanding of a sentence. The following are selected from a multitude of examples.

"And the sublime devotion of his soul covered his whole form, and his every feature, with a calm, divine majesty, the wondering disciples could only behold with a trembling reverence and awe." — p. 12.

"For somehow from its change, or its toil, its agonies and tears, if these may be appointed, a blessing is designed to be unfolded, the glories of the unseen world not now so truly bestow." — p. 117.

"When shall we learn that he who would inherit the bright joys of pure affections in immortal scenes, must drink most deeply of the cup of joy all true unions of the heart may here offer to his lips!" — p. 149.

"What are they to satisfy the infinite desire of a nature, only the infinite love of God can soothe to an abiding peace?" — p. 196.

The other grammatical inaccuracy to which we referred, is a confusion of moods and tenses in the same period. The subjoined instances are enough to show that we are not hypercritical.

"And when he *utters* the simple words, 'I am he,' even the rude soldiery *fell* backward, overpowered, awed for the moment, by the majestic calmness of his presence." — p. 10.

"Cruelty itself *shudders* at the thought of such intolerable pains, and *endeavored* to give a partial relief." — p. 24.

"Do we not know that the law *demanding* toil on earth, and thus *brings* forth energy and might in man is a glorious proof of his Father's love. — p. 33.

"For in a world where the angel and the worm alike are messengers of the Father's will, agents to accomplish His eternal purpose, I suppose the soul *may* never fully understand the mission of the minutest fact, until all its relations *should* be seen as they appear to the mind of God." — p. 66.

These are blemishes which a little care would have prevented. They are by no means trifling in such discourses as these. The smallest speck is noticeable on a fair brow, the least defect conspicuous in a fine painting. If a second edition of "The Bow in the Cloud" should be demanded — and we hope, and expect that such will be the case — we shall trust to find in it no such hindrances to the pleasure and comfort of its readers.

Having spoken thus plainly of the imperfections of the volume before us, and given several illustrations of them, it becomes a duty — and it is one which we take pleasure in performing — to present to our readers such specimens as the limits of this article will allow us to transcribe, of the finer qualities both of style and sentiment to which we have previously alluded.

The following eloquent paragraphs are from the sermon entitled "The Peace of God."

"It is true to the experience of every deeply tried heart perhaps, that some hours of wonderful calmness are known, even amid the keenest feeling of its trial. They come, like the deliverance of the disciples tossed in the midst of the sea of Galilee. Immediately, when Jesus entered the ship, it was at the land whither they went. And an inward composure occasionally appears almost as suddenly, in the intervals amid the hours of deepest agitation, in the saddest experiences of life. It is because a mighty trial often most effectually stills every anxiety, that such intervals of composure, as we say, strangely come. How surely these deeper experiences silence for the time the whole crowd of smaller anxieties and fears, often disturbing the whole of ordinary life! Then their clamor can no more be heard. We are taken as by force into a sphere of thought they cannot enter. The busy world, whose every pulse we have hitherto felt in every vein, lies then before the mind, as the great city before the eye, when the Sabbath has brought a stillness over all its bustle and confusion, and every hammer sleeps by the side of the work it has been framing. We are left alone with a towering calamity which instantly dispels all thought of our own strength, and brings us in absolute dependence unto God. The friend, the child, stands on the brink of

the grave, or is laid within it. We cannot but cry unto God. Even Atheism then must pray. We go in sincerity to the Father's throne. And when we ask *thus*, we must always receive. The greatness of the trial, showing our own nothingness, leads to that absolute trust, whose fruit is peace." — pp. 207, 208.

* * * * * *

"Let the feeling of entire dependence, the parent of an absolute trust, once be lost from the heart, and it sinks like the faithless Apostle beneath the wave. So have you seen the lake whose surface was entirely undisturbed, reflecting back in almost its original brightness the beauty and the hues of heaven. But when one breath of wind passes over it, a breath so gentle that it may scarcely be felt upon the cheek, in the moment you are gazing, all is gone. Thus does the soul lie open to the direct influence of the Father. He is bending over it with a glory, and a smile of love, that to the spiritual eye seems faintly imaged in the fairest scenes of nature's beauty. Let the heart be still. No disturbing breath must trouble even the surface of the deep sea of its deep affections. Let it lie in an absolute repose from its vain anxieties, and the light of God's countenance shall shine down into its profoundest depths." — p. 210.

One of the most attractive and impressive discourses in the volume is that on "The Death of the Young." We can easily conceive that it was prepared under the immediate impressions produced by the early departure of some lovely child from the parish, or perhaps even from the home of the preacher. We can imagine that the beautiful thoughts embodied in the quotation we are about to make, were actually suggested, and perhaps first uttered, in low and gentle tones of consolation, in the bosom of a bereaved family, contemplating, with their pastor, the fair countenance of the "early called," "sealed with the signet-ring of heaven;" while the morning sun was shining brightly, and all nature was radiant and tuneful with joy, and light and gladness seemed circulating everywhere, save only in that darkened chamber, and in the hearts of that sorrowing company.

"What blessed invitations to trust are spread out before our eyes! What invitations are coming in gracious words to the soul! How calmly nature looks upon the scene, when men are passing away! Who hath not seen her moon walking in brightness when the young and beautiful were departing, and the tide of joyous life was fast ebbing into the sea of eternity? Or who

hath not seen her sun in its rising beauty, or noonday glory, as the last sand of earthly existence fell? And who that witnessed it, hath not felt for the moment an added pang, through the contrast between the brightness of the world without, and the gloom of the clouded mind. Yet why *should* not the sun shine brightly still, and nature put on her garments of beauty? For a deeper reflection tells us no law can be violated; that is to say, no blessed design of providence can be hindered, when these early graves are filled. Why should not the unclouded light of heaven fall upon the tomb, where the early dead are resting? For it is a fitting expression of the true lesson of the providence we are witnessing. Nature smiles over the grave, as around the unbroken circles of human affection. No star is lost from the sky. No ray of light fails. The song of birds doth not cease. All the works of God are the same. Every thing blooms as before, though we are fallen from peace. Whatever is passive to the will of God remains unchanged. Only in man's soul it is dark. Is it not a sweet expression of the lesson of an equal trust to the human heart, descending from the heavens, ascending from the earth, in unnumbered forms? Does it not seem to say, God designs to besiege the soul by this all-encompassing host of His ministering spirits, until it should [shall] surrender its every thought of gloom?" — pp. 118 – 120.

There are many portions of the Discourses which are no less beautiful than these. No one who is suffering from the pangs of bereavement, or bowed down under the burden of trial and misfortune, can read them without being strengthened and consoled, without receiving new light upon the dark ways of Providence, and precious lessons for the improvement of adversity. We know not where to find a more distinct, thorough and able exposition of the true Christian doctrines concerning "Death," and "Sorrow," and "the Law of Consolation," and "the Sources of Peace." These are unfolded by various illustrations, and carried out into numerous applications. Indeed, their development and enforcement form the main design which runs through, and connects together all the discourses. And these doctrines are deduced from the example of Jesus, as well as from the words of the Gospel.

Death is represented as a provision of love, which should be regarded by the child of God as wearing the "same aspect of benignant grace that beams from every other law of His hand." It is not viewed as that mighty change in the very nature of our being, which some imagine it to be.

"According to Christianity, life and death are twin children of the same love. Present being and future being are only different parts of one whole. And between those parts, death scarcely interposes any seam. Life in all its periods is as one unbroken stream; growing wider, deeper, more beautiful, if you please — flowing at length amid fields of 'living green' and 'never withering flowers.' Yet still the stream is one. Only in part of its course it flows before our view, and in part beyond it. In both states we are in the same temple. In the one case, we are in the outer court, and in the other, in the holy place, perhaps lifting the veil before the holy of holies." And yet with the most cheering views of death, our author does not countenance the neglect of deep meditation concerning it, or the utter banishment of those sorrowful emotions which it naturally excites in the kind and loving heart. "We are to linger rather amidst these solemn thoughts, and even the griefs they bring. No blessing comes from the mourning, if we bury it in oblivion. Turn not away from the grave where the beloved are buried. Though it instantly fill the eyes with tears to look thereon, go and weep *there*. It is not nature to turn away. It is not wisdom. Go and embalm the memory of the lost in the unchanging, the fragrant affections of the human heart."

Sorrow, is, in like manner, represented as the wholesome, necessary discipline, appointed by a Father to purify and enrich and ennoble the nature of His children. "Do we not know that the Providence appointing the cross to all who have aught within the heart which needs a crucifixion, is the special token of His eternal benignity?" "In the depths of profound affliction, we are to find the springs of the heart's purest affections, the fathomless capacities of human love, and through the revelation of them, the revelation also of the Infinite Source whence alone they have their birth." Suffering is to be endured, not shunned, "as one of God's ministering angels, always present in earthly scenes." From the trial itself is to be drawn the balm of healing for the heart, and not aside from it. We should desire no false solace to beguile us, no superficial diversion from our grief. We should commune with our sorrows till they have unveiled to us the high messages they are commissioned to bring to the heart that has faith in Him,

whose errands they perform, and patience and submission to listen, and learn the lessons of His love.

"The law of consolation," we are taught, is, that the "habitually obedient and prepared life" alone, can fill the heart with resources of comfort and ministers of strength for the exigencies of existence and the hours of agony; that we cannot receive and comprehend at once the sublime and blessed truths, that give solace and refreshment to the soul in the night of its trial, but must *grow* into the knowledge of them. We must enter into their holy life and light, through the door and the pathway of living experience. "We may seek to impart some bright view of Providence, to a soul never moved by any deep spirit of trust and love. It is like an expectation that one may see the glorious prospect from the mountain's top, when he is still sitting in the caves of the earth. It is long, indeed, before the *believing* heart penetrates to the deeper treasures of strength and consolation in the truths to which it clings. It is long before the heart can become their fixed dwelling-place, their home." "And if the familiar faith conceal so long its deepest teachings, what can these *stranger thoughts* do to bless us?" "In the midnight of trial we must not expect that the lamp of trust will brightly burn, if the heart have lived in darkness in the prevailing spirit of its life, and been habitually untrustful before."

Lastly, the doctrine of these Discourses concerning "the way of peace" is, that it is the way of an "absolute trust." "It is not to be sought through any processes of argument the understanding may devise concerning the love of God, though they be based upon proofs radiant as the sun and numberless as the stars. It is to be found in the submission of the will, ceasing to question or to speculate. It is found in a filial temper. It is found in a spirit of unquestioning love. The descending of the angel into the garden to strengthen Jesus, images the thoughts of peace, naturally coming in darkest hours, when the heart can say, in simple trust, 'Thy will be done.'"

Such is a brief analysis of the principal doctrines which are developed in these Discourses. They are indeed great and exceedingly precious doctrines; the hardest lessons, perhaps, for the human heart to learn; the constant study of the Christian; whose deepest meaning cannot be wholly

comprehended by any one, who cannot also thoroughly comprehend the spirit and character of Jesus; and whose exposition, whenever it is given so earnestly, and so freshly from the experience and the heart, as it is in "The Bow in the Cloud," cannot be otherwise than welcome, interesting and valuable, to all who are seeking after, or advancing in, the path of eternal life. C. R.

Art. VI. — DOUBTS CONCERNING THE BATTLE OF BUNKER'S HILL.

ADDRESSED TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

Dear Brethren, — I address you by the appellation of *brethren*, for, as a man of the world, I wish to set an example of friendship and charity, in which Christian sects are too often wanting; and besides, as no unbeliever with whom I am acquainted is satisfied with his present opinions, and as we are at all times liable to give up the opinions we now hold, and to embrace something more consoling in the hour of affliction, I am not disposed to be more exclusive without faith, than some professed Christians are with it.

You profess to be believers in Christianity; and I have no reason to doubt your sincerity. But while I accord to you sincerity and honesty of purpose, you will agree with me, that faith and sight are two different things, and that the fact that we are fallible beings, should teach us that we are not infallible in all our speculations.

Man is naturally a credulous being. The bump of marvellousness is so fully developed in this race of ours, that the great mass of mankind are prepared to believe any story, which has a degree of mystery connected with it; and especially if the tale has come down from ancient times, or the scene is laid in a distant part of the world. It is a striking fact in relation to belief, that the object of belief must be a little extraordinary. And it matters not for what the person or event is distinguished, provided it be something out of the usual course.

I know I shall be met with the declaration, that man is a combative being, and that what is advanced or believed by one, will be assailed by another, and hence error is sure to be put down. I readily admit the position, but I deny the inference altogether. Error grows in the midst of controversy. So anxious are controversialists to fall upon others, that when a new theory is advanced, they seldom take the trouble to examine the theory itself, but content themselves with attacking some immaterial point; or they fall out upon some verbal criticism, or question of construction, thus suffering what in parliamentary language is called the "main question," to pass without debate as a sort of admitted truth. In this way many a theory grows up, and claims prescription for its support, while its friends and enemies are contending about some collateral question.

It is also manifest, that if a doctrine be permitted to grow up, even if this permission arise from the fact of its insignificance or absurdity, those who have been its abettors, dupes, or victims if it were possible, will adhere to it from a sense of pride, or even shame. A man deceived at an insignificant show, will pretend that is worthy of public patronage, that he may draw others into the same ridiculous position with himself; for no one likes to be the sole victim of a cheat.

I have made these remarks, to show the natural propensity in man to believe something, his unwillingness to abandon any opinion however hastily formed, and the great danger there is in believing what will not stand the test of close examination. I cannot perhaps better illustrate these principles than by selecting a case from the midst of us, and one too which has now become a subject of general, I had almost said, of universal belief. I allude to the Battle of Bunker's Hill. There is scarcely a man, woman, or child, who doubts the fact of that battle; and yet, if they were called upon for the ground of their faith, they would be compelled to admit that they believe it, because others do; that is, because such a belief is *fashionable*. They believe it, because others do; and would just as readily disbelieve it, if the tide of opinion set the other way. They believe it on the same principle that the Mahometans believe in the Koran, not because they know

anything of the evidence on which their belief rests, but because they have never heard it called in question.

You may perhaps be startled at the idea of rejecting what is so generally believed, and is so intimately connected with the history and glory of our country, as the Battle of Bunker's Hill is supposed to be. But I would ask, whether the glory of the country rests upon facts, or falsehoods. I have no desire to disturb what may be called the hallowed associations which cluster around that spot, but a faithful inquirer after truth should take nothing for granted; but should be governed by the weight of evidence, to whatever conclusions it may lead him. I am no more bound to believe in that battle, because such a belief is general, than I am to believe in any other popular error. If it be a fact that such a battle was ever fought, let it be proved; and if it be not a fact, the sooner it is discarded, the better for the honor of our country. The Romans, for ages, supposed that the glory of their country required a belief in the ridiculous story of Romulus and Remus being nursed by a wolf; but where is the sober man at the present day, who gives any credit to that idle tale? All nations have been disposed to rest their glory upon some remarkable exploit of their citizens, or some special interposition of Providence. On this principle our own people are disposed to recur to the battle of Bunker's Hill, and have regarded it as an event fully sustained by proof — a sort of "fixed fact." This principle is so riveted into the minds of our people, has so fastened itself upon the wisest and ablest of them, that the great "expounder of the Constitution," when vindicating the character of Massachusetts, appeared to think that a reference to this battle-field would establish the patriotism of his adopted State. "There is Concord, and Lexington, and *Bunker's Hill* — and there they will remain forever."

Now, is it not by uses such as these, more than by any positive proof, that the belief in that battle is sustained? Is there not a degree of local or State pride, which greatly strengthens this faith? People always find it convenient to have some admitted principle, some uncontroverted position, some foregone conclusion, to which they can recur at a moment's warning in any emergency. Such is the Battle of Bunker's Hill. Read the political addresses,

and the Fourth of July orations, and you will find that Bunker's Hill is an essential ingredient — as indispensably necessary as the Heathen gods are to ancient poetry. This labor-saving principle, which takes things for granted, and uses them without the disagreeable task of proving them, has been the source of most of the errors in the world. And may we not ascribe the general belief in this battle to the same principle? It is also very difficult to correct any long established opinion, and especially if the belief be general, however feeble the evidence on which it rests. So strongly inclined are most people to cherish preconceived opinions, especially when these coincide with their wishes or interests, that they will hardly yield to any authority, however decisive.

I fear therefore, that I may not be able to convince the public, that the battle in question is a mere fiction. But I will discharge my duty, whether the people will hear or forbear. Those of you who admit the force of reasoning — and those who do not, I despair of convincing; for you cannot reason that *out* of a man, which was never reasoned *in* — will agree with me, that faith, to be valuable, must rest upon evidence; and that before you can consistently call upon a man to believe, you should place sufficient evidence within his reach. Now what evidence have we of the Battle of Bunker's Hill? You will probably appeal to history. But what court of justice would receive mere hearsay evidence? The historians who have written and the poets who have sung of this famous battle, do not pretend that they were eye-witnesses of the scene they describe. There seems to be a kind of sacredness attached to history, to which it is not entitled. What are the elements of history? From what sources do historians gather their facts? Either from tradition, or from some hasty and imperfect accounts published at the time. Now does not every one know, that little or no reliance can be placed upon tradition? And the published accounts are equally uncertain. We naturally receive such accounts with great allowance; and upon flying rumor we place still less reliance. But are these hasty and imperfect accounts, or these rumors, entitled to any more credit after they are embodied in what is called history? If the historian live at the time the event took place, he is as

liable to be biased by prejudice as other men; and if he live long after the event, he may not possess the best means of information. In either case his authority is of a questionable character. But in this very instance we find that historians differ, and differ too in some very important particulars, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter.

But before we proceed to examine this wonderful page in our country's history, it will be necessary to settle certain principles in relation to evidence. One of the most acute logicians, Mr. Hume, says, "Experience is the only sure guide to reasoning concerning matters of fact. Experience in some things is variable, in others uniform. A variable experience gives rise only to probability; an uniform experience amounts to proof. Our belief or assurance of any fact from the report of eye-witnesses, is derived from no other principle than experience; that is, our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses."

Let us apply these principles of the great metaphysician to the case before us. Many of you, as well as myself, have seen the town of Charlestown, — and what has been our experience concerning it? Have we seen Bunker's Hill the camp of Mars, and the town in flames? Nothing like it. We have seen it repeatedly, and have witnessed no such spectacle. Our experience, our uniform experience, leads us to the conclusion that no such battle was ever fought there. Now, according to Mr. Hume, "a uniform experience amounts to proof." We have then proof positive, that Charlestown has never been the scene of blood that has been represented. If we rely upon our own experience, the matter is decided at once; and decided against the commonly received opinion. And if we take into the account the experience of others, we shall come to nearly the same conclusion. Of our acquaintances more than ninety-nine out of a hundred, who have visited that place, will testify that their experience corresponds entirely with ours. The experience of our acquaintances, then, is as ninety-nine to one against the actual occurrence of the battle. There are, it is true, a few individuals among us, who profess to have been eye-witnesses of the scene which is reported to have occurred on the 17th of June, 1775. But what is our experience in relation to human testimony?

We know that most men may easily be deceived, and that there are not wanting those who will willingly deceive others. We must bear in mind, that we have the experience of ninety-nine to one against this pretended battle; and that the experience of the ninety-nine is uniform, whereas the experience of the one is variable. The few who profess to have seen the battle, will themselves allow that they have visited this famous spot at other times, and have not beheld anything like what appeared to their vision on that day. Their experience of the battle, therefore, is not only contrary to the experience of others, but contrary to their own experience at all other times. Now by adopting Mr. Hume's system of balancing the different experiences of individuals, we shall find that the weight of experience is altogether against what has been generally believed on this subject.

There are other considerations which go far to weaken the testimony of the few, who pretend to have been eye-witnesses of the scene. They are now old, superannuated men, whose memories are so treacherous that they can scarcely relate the events of yesterday. Surely these are not the most trustworthy witnesses of what took place seventy years ago. But there is another consideration which should not be overlooked. The Battle of Bunker's Hill is a public affair, and such is the degeneracy of the age, that most men think it fair play to cheat the public. Men of honest minds, who would disdain to misrepresent in any case between individuals, will in relation to public affairs testify to what they know to be untrue, without seeming aware that a wrong has been committed. Now the witnesses in favor of the Bunker's Hill affair are thus situated. The testimony, though false, does not injure directly any individual; and they can keep themselves in countenance by saying, that they have not borne false witness against their "neighbor," but have sustained a glorious page in their country's history.

But there are objections to these witnesses of a graver character. They are *interested*, and hence, by every rule of law, are not competent witnesses. Or if it should be said, that their interest is not of such a character as to destroy their competency, it must certainly affect their credibility, and greatly weaken the force of their testimony. For the

last seventy years there has been a sort of charm in this pretended battle, and a kind of glory has seemed to gather around the head of every one who has succeeded in making the public believe, that he was an actor in that scene. This has led many a boasted pretender to assert, that he was one of the choice few who stood forth in defence of liberty on that eventful day — that he was one of those gallant spirits, who "fought, bled, and died on Bunker's awful mount." To such excess have the public run upon this subject, that many are desirous of retaining the honor in their family, of having been on that venerated spot during the battle in the loins of their ancestors; hence we frequently meet in the graveyards, among the inscriptions, (which are generally more remarkable for their extravagance and want of truth, than for their modesty or fidelity,) a declaration that the deceased was a "Revolutionary hero," or that he was "in the battle of Bunker's Hill."

Under these circumstances, and with such an enthusiasm of feeling, the testimony of all the pretended actors in that drama must be received with great allowance. But for the last twenty years there has been another, and greater disqualification. Congress has adopted the pension system, a system which in all other countries has exerted a corrupting influence. By this system all who served for a certain period in the war of the Revolution, are entitled to the bounty of the Government. Thus a direct motive has been held out for false witness on this subject. Not that we accuse those of perjury, who have made oath that they were in the battle of Bunker's Hill. We know the propensity of some men to believe. They will begin with desiring to have been actors in a certain scene; they will soon fancy that they were in some way or other connected with it; they will go on adding little by little, and repeating the tale so often, that at length they will not be able to distinguish between what they saw in early life, and what they have often repeated; and hence, by this progressive faith, will really become believers in their own idle tales. This principle may operate upon some of the witnesses of this pretended battle. Under this system of pensions from the General Government, and gratuities from our State Government, the surest road to honor and profit has been, to be a hero of Bunker's Hill. It is unnecessary for me to

labor the point, that this direct interest greatly weakens the credibility of the witnesses.

But according to Mr. Hume, when the event itself is improbable, a greater degree of evidence is necessary to sustain it. Now there are on the face of this story many improbabilities. The battle of Bunker's Hill and the burning of Charlestown are to be regarded as one event. We know that by the then existing laws of Great Britain,—which has been denominated the "bulwark of the religion we profess," — no person was eligible to office, unless he belonged to the Established Church; and is it credible, that a professor of the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, a religion full of mercy and good fruits, should be guilty of such wanton barbarity as General Gage must have shown, in burning the dwellings of the peaceable inhabitants, and turning the women and children of Charlestown, houseless, into the streets? The manifest inconsistency of such conduct with the character of a professed Christian, compels us to ask for the strongest possible evidence.

But there is another improbability, of greater weight. The Americans are said to have acted under the direction of General Putnam, who from his having served in an earlier war against the French in Canada, must be supposed to have had some knowledge of military operations. Every one who is acquainted with the localities, knows that Charlestown is a peninsula connected with the main land on the west by a narrow belt called "the neck;" and that the place said to be fortified by the Americans with their temporary breast-work, is situated towards the easterly part of the town. Now no experienced General, no man of ordinary military skill, would presume to post his troops in a position so hazardous. He would perceive at once, that the enemy, by crossing Charles river in his boats, and taking possession of the neck and the high land near it, would render their retreat impossible; and thus the whole party would be cut off. It is altogether incredible, that an officer of the reputed talent of General Putnam should have been guilty of such an egregious blunder—such an exposure of his men to certain destruction. But if General Putnam had been guilty of such a stupid arrangement, it is altogether incredible, that a commander of the reputation of General Gage should have failed to avail himself of this

error. He could see from Copp's Hill, at the north end of Boston, and also from Beacon Hill, the exact position of the Americans and the character of their temporary works; and he must have known, that by crossing the river, and taking possession of "the neck" and Bunker's Hill in their rear, the whole body would be completely in his power. But, as the story goes, he embarked his troops at Long Wharf, and landed them near the present Navy Yard in Charlestown, so giving the Americans every opportunity to escape. Now I submit it to any military man to say, whether it is at all probable that General Putnam would have been guilty of so great an oversight, or that the experienced commander of the British forces would have failed to avail himself of such an error of his enemy. Such a series of blunders as the account ascribes to these distinguished commanders, renders the account itself highly suspicious. But admit that the whole story was got up by some person or persons unacquainted with military operations, and the difficulty is solved.

There is also an improbability in the success of this pretended battle. Who can believe, that a few undisciplined troops brought together on a sudden emergency, with poor arms and a very scanty supply of ammunition, could for so long a time withstand the veteran troops of Great Britain, led on by experienced and brave commanders, and supported by the battery on Copp's Hill and by three or four ships of war? There is so much of romance in this page of pretended history, that we are even called upon to believe, that after the Americans had expended their powder and ball, they sustained themselves for a time by throwing stones at the enemy!

But what is still more conclusive in this case is, that the pretended eye-witnesses of this famous battle differ in some of the most important particulars in relation to the events of that day. Some twenty years ago, when many of the pretended actors in that drama were living, who are now in their graves, an account was published by a distinguished citizen of this Commonwealth, who professed to have been present, and to have commanded a company in that battle. He denied to General Putnam the honor of commanding the troops in person on the Hill, and ascribed that honor to Col. Prescott. This account drew forth a reply from the

friends of General Putnam, accompanied with numerous affidavits of pretended eye-witnesses, declaring that Putnam was present in command upon the Hill during the action. Thus called upon, the author of the account alluded to, procured and published a large number of affidavits sustaining his position, that Putnam was not upon the Hill during the battle. Here we have a striking instance of conflicting testimony from the very persons who professed to have been eye-witnesses, and this difference relates not to some trifling circumstance, but to an essential fact in the history, viz. the name of the commander. Every person acquainted with the history of military exploits, knows that the chief glory of a battle consists in conferring a sort of immortality upon the officer in command. The question, therefore, who commanded on Bunker's Hill, is important, and to men of military sensibility the most important one connected with this whole subject. And yet on this all-important point, the eye-witnesses, though under oath, expressly contradict each other. Who would expect such discrepancy, such flat contradiction, among eye-witnesses? And what confidence can be placed upon testimony of this character? The testimony of one class of these deponents *must* be false, and the testimony of both may be. The question of the existence of the battle itself was not raised during that controversy; if it had been, may we not fairly infer that there would have been as great a contradiction in the testimony in that case as in the other? With men of "military mind" you might as well have no battle at all, as to be in doubt to whom the honor of command belongs. On supposition that the whole story is a fabrication, we can easily account for this conflicting testimony; but if such a battle were ever fought, it seems incredible that there should be a dispute as to the commander, among the officers and men who were in the engagement. But as it is, we have two conflicting accounts, and two heroes claiming the honors of that eventful day.

There is also just that confusion in localities, which we might naturally expect in fiction. It is called the Battle of *Bunker's* Hill, when all the people in that region will tell you, that there never was a battle fought upon Bunker's Hill. Even those who have been so fearful that the whole account would be disbelieved or forgotten, as to attempt

to perpetuate the fiction by the erection of a monument, have virtually confessed that there was no battle on Bunker's Hill, by placing their monument on *Breed's* Hill. Does not this confusion of names and localities cast suspicion over the whole account? When we read the genealogies of the Heathen deities, where similar confusion occurs, we account for it by the fact that the whole is fabulous. Must not the same confusion lead to the same result in this case?

But it may be asked, why such a story should be invented, and how such a general belief should obtain, if the whole is a mere fiction? The same questions might be asked concerning the Heathen mythology, to which I have just alluded; but our inability to answer these questions definitely, does not establish those ridiculous and absurd tales. We may not be able at this late day, seventy years after the event is said to have taken place, to point out the fabricator of this story. But it is sufficient to say, that every age has its own peculiar hobby, and that at that period military exploits were all the rage. There was at that time such a feverish state of the public mind, that any story which went in any degree to cast reproach upon the "regulars," as the British troops were called in common speech, would be readily received by the great mass of the people. Besides, the people of Massachusetts had a strong motive for wishing to excite the sympathy of the other Colonies. The port of Boston was shut up. The town was occupied by British troops, who had committed many outrages upon the inhabitants. Whether Massachusetts should contend single-handed with such a foe, or whether she should enlist the other Colonies in her behalf, was a question of vital consequence to her. May we not, therefore, safely infer, that some knowing one, judging rightly of the effect that such a battle would have upon the Colonies generally, invented this story in order to bring aid from abroad, and to show the people that England was determined to reduce them to vassalage by fire and sword? I do not say that this was the fact; but is there not a strong probability in its favor? May we not fairly infer, that it was a Yankee trick, got up and played off to answer the purpose mentioned above? We know that the report of the battle did arouse the Colonies; and if the story had been invented,

as it answered a good purpose at the time, there would be a strong inducement to keep up the cheat until the close of the war. Nor could the people of Massachusetts, consistently with their interest, abandon the story on the return of peace. Every State was deeply involved in debt, and all were desirous of obtaining all the aid they could from the General Government. The story of the burning of Charlestown, the bravery of the Yankees on the occasion, and the cost of that battle to the Colony, would plead loudly in her behalf; so that, if we admit the account to have been fabricated, there were strong inducements to keep up the delusion.

But perhaps it may be said, that the erection of the monument is sufficient proof of the fact in question. I have no disposition to overlook the monument, or any circumstance which is supposed to bear upon the question before us; but I wish to inquire, how a monument erected on *Breed's* Hill proves that a battle was ever fought on *Bunker's* Hill? If a monument in one place settles the authenticity of the account of a battle in another, why may not this same monument authenticate the account of the battle at Yorktown, or Waterloo? Besides, who would ever refer to image-worship to prove the truth of Christianity? Does not the introduction of symbols of any kind rather show, that the belief in the thing or event represented is on the wane? If there was a full and firm belief that Bunker's Hill had been such a field of glory as has been represented, would there be any need of a pile of granite erected on the spot? The people of Charlestown would naturally feel a pride and an interest in keeping up the impression, that the Revolutionary drama was opened within her borders; and the people in the vicinity, and especially in the city of Boston, would naturally partake of the same feeling; and if they saw that the belief in the oft-told tale of the battle of Bunker's Hill was declining, what is more natural than that they should get up something like the Monument Association, for the purpose of erecting that obelisk which has attracted the gaze of thousands, and gives a sort of notoriety to the place?

The success which attended the erection of that monument, is just what might have been expected on supposition that the whole account of the battle was fabulous. Appli-

cation was made to the Legislature of Massachusetts for aid in its erection; but with all the local interest which was brought to bear upon the subject, the State did little or nothing in furtherance of the object. Now is it not almost certain, that the patriotic Legislature of the patriotic State of Massachusetts would have contributed largely to that magnificent undertaking, if they had believed that it was commemorative of an event which had actually taken place? Would a Government which extends its fostering care to pickerel and herring, to woodcocks and the "least wing that flits along the sky," withhold its patronage from an Association whose object was to awaken patriotic emotions, and pay a deserved tribute to the memory of those who hazarded all for their country's good? Would a State which pours out its treasures like water in aid of every benevolent enterprise, and which encourages science and history by causing a *survey* (for this is the term used by the Legislature) of "bird, beast, fish, insect, what no eye can see"— would such a State suffer such a noble undertaking to linger twenty years, if its citizens really believed that it was designed to commemorate one of the proudest events in our history? The course pursued by our State Government is altogether inexplicable on any other ground than the one we have suggested, — that great doubts existed whether such a battle was ever fought.

In fact, such was the state of public feeling, (arising from doubts of the truth of this famous exploit, we presume,) that it is very doubtful whether the monument would have been undertaken at all, had not a combination of circumstances favored the commencement of the work. The Masonic institution, which professes to be perfectly *at home* in everything relating to "geometry and architecture," and especially in building in stone and mortar, had not at that time wholly lost its popularity in the State. And availing themselves of the pageantry of that order, the Association for erecting the monument invited the Masons to lay the corner-stone "in due form." One of the most distinguished statesmen and orators of the country was selected to deliver the Address on the occasion; and the nation's guest, the great and good Lafayette, being at that time in the country, was invited to be present. All these circumstances drew together a vast concourse of people, and gave

an impulse to the undertaking. But it is presumed that few, very few, of those who were present on that occasion, intended by their presence to endorse the account of a battle fought there, half a century before. They wished to see Lafayette and Webster, and to witness the pomp and ceremony of the Masonic institution, with its mystic rites, unintelligible symbols, and "hieroglyphics older than the Nile." It is too great a draft upon human credulity, to ask us to believe, that that vast assembly was a cloud of witnesses in favor of the portion of history under consideration.

The work was commenced under the circumstances we have mentioned; but when this unnatural, or rather artificial impulse had subsided, and the people came to their sober senses, the work was abandoned, and it stood a half finished monument of the credulity of a people long celebrated for their "notions." Several attempts were made to raise funds sufficient to complete the monument, but with little success. At length, the Mechanic Association, probably more from a desire to show the merchants and wealthy men in the Commonwealth, that they were not behind them in liberality, than from any well founded faith in the event to be commemorated, undertook to finish the structure. But active and persevering as they were, their faith and works both failed them, and the labor upon the monument was again suspended. Now all this is perfectly natural on our hypothesis, but totally irreconcilable with the position that the battle was a reality. It is difficult to believe, that the wealthy merchants of Boston, whose liberality is proverbial, would have suffered this work to linger as it did, if they were satisfied of the reality of the event it proposed to perpetuate. But if the merchants of Boston had for once forgotten themselves, and acted so contrary to their former character, we are confident that nothing but the want of faith could have restrained the intelligent, energetic and noble-spirited mechanics of the Commonwealth, or prevented their finishing that time-enduring work.

As further evidence that real doubts existed, we may mention the fact, that part of the ground, on which the battle was reported to have been fought, was actually sold for building lots. Is it possible, that, if it was really believed so important an event took place on that spot, any part of it could have been alienated for so unworthy a purpose?

But there was one expedient more to be tried. The ladies, always noted for their credulity as well as for their generosity and untiring zeal, were at last appealed to; and they were imploringly asked to finish what the men had hardly faith enough to begin. They entered upon the work with alacrity; but even the faith and constancy of woman failed, before the cap-stone was brought on with rejoicing. Here the "work of faith and labor of love" were exhausted, and the work would, in all probability, have been abandoned, had not the spirited and energetic contractor, perhaps to save his own reputation, and secure his pay for what he had already done, conceived the plan of levying a tax upon the pilgrims who should resort to this American Mecca. Consequently he provided a steam-engine, (for everything in these galloping days must go by steam,) and the necessary apparatus, by which the pilgrims were raised to the top of this majestic pillar. By the help of this tax he was enabled to complete the monument about twenty years after it was commenced.

Now in view of all the circumstances connected with the erection of this granite pile, have we not reason to suspect, that the public have entertained great doubts of the authenticity of the portion of history under consideration? Or rather is not this great delay inconsistent with a well grounded faith on the part of the people, and perfectly consistent with the hypothesis we have assumed? And now that the monument is completed, the same system of levying contributions upon visitors is kept up, that was adopted by the Catholic priests in the dark ages. Those who ascend this monastic column, walking up its dark winding passage, with a dim light in their hands, must pay a tribute, not of respect to the memory of our fathers, but of money to the guardian goddess of Bunker's Hill.

There are at this time many means resorted to, to keep up the impression that the history of this battle is not fabulous. Besides the tax imposed upon those whom credulity or curiosity may lead to the spot, there is also a sort of Dioramic show of this battle, which has been got up with great ingenuity, and which has been exhibited in various parts of the country, by which the owners are enabled to levy a contribution upon hundreds of those who never visited the battle-field. This is a kind of second edition of

the devices of the Romish Church, by which those who never saw one of their saints when alive, are enabled to see and to possess, if they are able to pay the purchase money, some pretended relic of him when dead.

But the boldest expedient is yet to be mentioned. The Masons, it is said, have erected a little monument within the great one, to aid in commemorating the fading glories of this memorable battle. This is drawing upon our credulity in the same manner the Irish monk did upon the traveller, when he showed him two skulls of St. Patrick, the one his skull when he was an adult, the other his skull when he was a boy!

All these influences are brought to bear upon the subject, to keep up the faltering faith in that pretended military exploit. There is also a local interest, a State pride, which fosters this belief. Vermont points to Bennington, New York to White Plains, New Jersey to Princeton, and Virginia to Yorktown, and it is a pity, if Massachusetts cannot divide the glories of the Revolution with her sister States, when she contributed so largely of her blood and treasure to carry on that war. Her efforts in that struggle would justly entitle her to at least one consecrated spot, to which those who have no patriotism themselves can point, and boast of the patriotism of their ancestors. Not that I would call in question the patriotism of our citizens generally; but it is true of Massachusetts men, as well as others, that those who have the most to say of the heroes of the Revolution, and who point to Bunker's Hill the most frequently, have the least of that self-denying spirit, which characterized our ancestors. Such men could hardly sustain themselves, if Bunker's Hill were blotted from their memory. This local feeling, this State pride, this boast of our father's patriotism, uttered so loudly by those who have none themselves, united with pecuniary interest, serves to keep up a pretended or real belief in the event. And besides, all who have contributed to the erection of the monument, are committed to that belief. For such persons to reject this boasted page in our history, would be confessing either that they had been imposed upon themselves, or that they had endeavored to impose upon others. And the number thus committed is very great; for I believe, in some cases the subscription was restricted to the small sum

of five dollars as the maximum, on the plea that no one might be deprived of the opportunity of having his name enrolled among those who cherished a grateful remembrance of the deeds of departed heroes. But may not this limited subscription be fairly construed into an admission, that five dollars was the measure of the strongest faith on this subject; and may we not infer that this was a device to enlist as many as possible, so that if this pretended battle should ever be called in question, these subscribers should ever hold their peace?

Taking all these circumstances into view, it is not at all surprising that the great mass of the people should believe, or pretend to believe, in this opening scene of the Revolutionary drama. The mass believe in it, because the belief is fashionable. The superstitious believe in it, because they think it nearly allied to impiety to call it in question. The worldly wise and prudent acquiesce in it, through fear that an agitation of the question would produce excitement. And the unprincipled demagogue adopts it, because he finds Bunker's Hill a convenient watch-word to excite the passions of the ignorant.

I might pursue this subject further, and show other causes which, in the want of sufficient evidence, serve to keep up this belief; but I deem it unnecessary. I have shown on the great principles of Mr. Hume's theory, that the battle of Bunker's Hill is not entitled to our belief; that experience, that great touchstone of truth, is decidedly against it; that the event itself is improbable; that the witnesses in its favor are interested, and that their testimony is contradictory. We have also seen that the tardiness in the erection of the monument furnishes a strong presumptive argument, that those who erected it had but a wavering faith in the event the structure proposed to perpetuate; and that local feeling, personal interest, and State pride will easily account for the general belief we find in the community, even admitting the history of the event to be fabulous.

I do not intend to be dogmatical, but I would respectfully ask whether we have not made out our case. Have we not shown on the theory laid down by Mr. Hume, that the people have been grossly deceived upon this subject? I think we have. We have followed out the reasoning of

the great logician, and are, as it seems to me, compelled to admit, either that the accounts we have read from our childhood of the battle of Bunker's Hill are all a fabrication, or that Hume's great argument is fallacious and his positions false. Here then is the dilemma. And which horn shall we embrace? If we follow Hume, we shall unsettle the faith of thousands, and destroy all confidence in history; and if we adhere to the common opinion of the events of June 17th, 1775, we assail the great logician, draw upon ourselves the charge of being credulous, and are justly exposed to the sneers of all unbelievers. Nay, more; if we reject Hume's theory, we shall be charged with being led by Campbell, and other priests, who, it is said, are interested in keeping up a great reverence for what is called *faith*. If we discard the theory of Hume, we shall be accused of being priest-ridden, and so wanting in manly independence. Moreover, we shall, in such case, be required to believe not only in the battle of Bunker's Hill, but in other events recorded in history. We shall also be compelled to believe in the events recorded in the Scriptures, and to receive the precepts of Christ and his Apostles, which have always been found to be troublesome companions for those of us, who, rejecting Puritanism, wish not only to think, but to act and live freely — that is, to enjoy our "home-bred and fire-side rights."

On a full view of the whole subject, I am inclined to adhere to the theory laid down by Hume, who may be regarded as the father of all rational unbelief. His theory makes short work of miracles and the other dogmas of religion. It is too laborious a task, to refute all the arguments which are brought in support of Christianity, even if it were possible. Who can have patience to plod through Lardner's elaborate "Credibility," or even Paley's "Evidences of Christianity?" Butler's "Analogy" requires more study and thought, than most of us wish to bestow upon that subject. West on the "Resurrection of Christ" is a small book, but is exceedingly difficult to answer; and Littleton on the "Conversion of St. Paul" has so perplexed me, that I have resolved never to attempt to read it again. Leland's "View of Deistical Writers" presents the opinions of our friends in such an awkward light, that I have no patience with it; and even Leslie's "Short and Easy

Method with the Deists," is far too *long* and *hard* for me to answer. Now considering the multiplicity of books in support of Divine revelation, and the great difficulty there is in answering their arguments in detail, I have felt the necessity of some "short and easy method" of meeting these arguments at once; and I find nothing so convenient as Hume's theory. I can answer all these writers, meet all their arguments, and overthrow all their statements, by the talismanic reply of Mr. Hume — *The experience of the world is against it.*

This summary mode of meeting all kinds of troublesome arguments, I have found of great service on innumerable occasions. I therefore cling to it. I regard it as a kind of labor-saving machine, which answers every purpose, and has this additional recommendation, that the superficial can employ it just as well as the profound. I have found it perfectly satisfactory in speculation. I say *in speculation*, for I must confess, that it will not hold good in the common affairs of life. When I first became acquainted with the writings of Mr. Hume, I was so pleased with his theory, that I resolved to make it the rule of my life in the management of my ordinary affairs. But you can hardly conceive of my mortification, when I found this, my favorite theory utterly to fail me. I learned by that very experience which Mr. Hume commends, that his theory led me to doubt everything, to withdraw confidence from every body, and refrain from all action whatever. I found it would paralyze all effort, destroy all business transactions, and produce a sort of Mesmeric sleep in the whole community. My embarrassment was extreme; but I soon extricated myself from this difficulty by adopting a theory of my own concerning Mr. Hume's theory, viz. that his grand position of human experience was *merely theoretical*, — well adapted to matters of speculation, but never designed to apply to the tangibilities of real life.

This view of Mr. Hume's theory, I find exceedingly convenient. I can use it or disuse it, as the case may require. I employ it in all matters of mere opinion, in all abstract speculations, but discard it, or rather lay it aside, in all cases of a practical character. In this way I enjoy all the benefits of his theory without any of its embarrassments. But utility is not the only recommendation of my theory;

it avoids many popular objections. I keep temporals and spirituals entirely separate; and hence can never be accused of designing to unite Church and State. I keep everything in its place, and have appropriate modes of reasoning for each particular department, thus giving to each a portion in due season.

I have thus expressed myself freely, and have given my views without reserve; and I trust that I shall not be discarded for my frankness, or be pronounced an infidel. It is true that I reject revelation, but why should I be denied the Christian name on that account, any more than others? C. H.

ART. VII. — POETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

I. THE SNOW.

THE snow has come: — o'er field and hill
Its fleecy mantle wide is thrown;
And winter's breezes, stern and chill,
Through leafless branches sadly moan.

Hush'd is the song in every grove,
And fled the warblers far away;
Forgot their spring-told tale of love,
Amid December's ruder lay.

Each little flower, that late so fair
Was mirrored in the passer's eye,
All wither'd lies. — Alas! the rare,
The beautiful live but to die.

O say not so. — The cold, cold grave
May shut them from our earthly view;
But He, th' All-powerful to save,
Doth point us to their glory too.

Believe each season, as it goes,
A lesson brings for us to know;
Perhaps 't will speak of present woes —
Perchance some future bliss foreshow.

Then hail! thou wintry robe of white!
Fair messenger of swift decay!
What though thou tell'st of waning light; —
Thou heraldest a brighter day.

W. V.

II. A PARABLE.

From the German of Frederick Rückert.

Before the Sultan's throne appears
The mewlana, with lowly brow.
"Thy wisdom's fame hath reached mine ears;
Then answer me one question now.
Four several sects, well knowest thou,
My faithful Mussulmans divide;
Without delay, then, tell me now,
With which doth Allah's favor side?
By which of these four pathways, say,
Shall dust attain to Allah's throne?
In doubt I've waited till this day,
Now let the certainty be known."
The Sultan spake, and waited, dumb.
The mewlana gazed silently
A moment round the audience-room,
And then he said, with bended knee: —
"Thou in whose throne the faithful race
The throne of Heaven reflected see,
Protect me with thy shield of grace,
Then shall my answer be to thee.
Thou sit'st enthroned here in a hall
To which four doors thy slaves admit,
And all thy splendor bursts on all,
Through whichsoe'er they enter it.
That I did not mistake the way,
Thy messenger the praise must claim;
And, dazzled by the bright display,
I know not, now, which way I came."

C. T. B.

III. INVOCATION.

UNSHEATH thy sword, Orion! let it flash
Athwart the firmament. Ye Sisters six,
No longer mourn the lost Merope! Earth —
For love of which she veiled her starry brow,
And faded dimly in the distance — earth
Hath cast her off, and she comes back to heaven.
Stay in your starry course, ye hosts of heaven!
Look upon earth — the bright — the beautiful —
The God-created earth, and quench with tears
The fire which man is kindling. And, O Thou!
Eternal Source of life and light, stretch forth
Thine arm omnipotent — in mercy save
The work of thine own hands. *Man hath gone mad!*
In vain the heralds of thy Son proclaim
Tidings of peace, in vain their hands uplift
The banner of the Cross! Man heeds them not,
Or heeds them but to scoff. He talks of *war*
As of a pastime; and, with fiendish joy,
Makes haste to treat his brother as his foe,
And crush with iron heel into the dust
The image of his Maker. Prince of Peace!
Were all thy promises but idle words?
Was Calvary sprinkled with thy blood in vain?
Is night still resting on thy sepulchre?
Father! our hearts are failing us for fear.
We fly to thee for succor. Lift thou up
The sunlight of thy countenance, and cause
The spirit of thy Son to walk across
The troubled waters; — then shall all be calm
And hushed to peace. Speed on the day when men,
No longer slaves to ignorance and sin,
Shall learn to war and fight no more; when earth,
Hallowed in all her borders, shall take up
The angels' song and peal it back to heaven: —
"Glory to God on high; peace, peace on earth,
Good-will toward man!" O, let thy kingdom come!
For thine the kingdom is, and thine the power,
And to thy name be glory evermore!

C.

IV. THE TREE OF LIFE.

From the German of Rückert.

When Father Adam lay at his last groan,
He sent to Paradise his faithful son,
A twig to fetch him from the Tree of Life,
Whereby he hoped recovery might be won.
Seth plucked the twig and brought it home, but lo!
Our Father's ghost, with his last breath, had flown.
Then planted they the twig on Adam's grave,
And so from son to son 't was handed down.
It grew, when in the pit young Joseph lay, —
When Egypt's taskmasters made Israel groan.
That tree put forth its blossoms fragrantly,
When David, harping, sate upon his throne.
Dry was the tree, when, in his wisdom, erred
From the Lord's way the sage king Solomon.
Yet every generation hoped to see
Its life renewed in David's greater Son.
Faith saw that day, in spirit, when she sate
In sorrow by the floods of Babylon.
And when the eternal lightning flashed from heaven,
Then burst the tree with high exultant tone.
God's grace had chose its withered stock to be
The passion-wood, to stretch his Christ upon.
The blind world hewed its timber to a cross,
And slew, with scorn, its own dear hope thereon.
Then did the tree of life bear bloody fruit,
That whoso tasted, life should be his own.
O Freimund, look! despite the storms of time,
How high and broad the tree of life hath grown.
Its *shadow* falls e'en now on half the world;
When shall the whole its grateful *shelter* own!

C. T. B.

ART. VIII. — MEMOIR OF HENRY WARE.*

THE book which has been so earnestly desired, is now in the hands of the many friends of Henry Ware. It has been read and approved. Undoubtedly there may be different opinions as to its execution, though we have heard of few exceptions to the general expression of grateful satisfaction. The book is not an eulogy, and none could wish it to be. It would not have comported with the character of the subject, or the relation of the writer. And this last may have prevented other features, which some would have been glad to see. The delicacy of a brother would naturally temper much of the ardor of expression, which another might have indulged. Yet while the ardor glows in every heart that knew Henry Ware, the very thought of him, in all his meekness and habitual moderation, does of itself forbid us to utter the half of what we feel, and we even thank the biographer that he has left so much unuttered. But all cannot be repressed. We must utter some of our feeling, not only for the man, but also for the Memoir. It does seem to us a most successful effort, and appropriate tribute. This conviction is strengthened by a second perusal. It is precisely the book which one would wish to make for a brother, and such a brother. It is a book, which, we believe, Henry Ware himself, with all his severity of judgment as well as sensitiveness of nature, would approve. Flattery he abhorred, and there is none here. Extravagance he always avoided, and scrupulously has his biographer avoided it, even where it might have been pardoned. But we value the Memoir, yet more, for its usefulness. It will do good — and then will it accomplish the great object, for which he, whom it delineates, lived and labored. The earnest declarations which we have heard, as to the impression it makes, from some not apt to feel or speak thus, the interest it is calculated to awaken in those least familiar with its facts, the high yet reasonable and attainable mark to which it points the young minister, and every Christian believer, the vast results which it gradually exhibits by the very narrative of events, in its calm tone and just

* *Memoir of the Life of Henry Ware, jr.* By his Brother, JOHN WARE, M. D. Boston: Munroe & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 484.

measure, satisfy us that it will take the place in the public regard, to which its name entitles it. Beautifully does the life speak, naturally and movingly does the man stand before us, and the whole work seems to us nearer an autobiography, than we supposed it possible for another to make. Some of us, it is true, are interested and partial judges, but the judgment is confirmed by the reception of the book and the common voice, so far as heard.

Leaving that voice to speak for itself, and the book to make its own way, we desire only to enter upon these pages a brief record of a life so important, a character so pure and beloved. This we must be allowed to do without formality, and with little restraint upon feelings so strong as those which a favored intimacy awakened. The leading events of the life are known, but some sketch of them should be found in this journal. We can give no extracts, and if we quote from letters, it will be from some in our own possession not published.

The childhood of Henry Ware was passed in Hingham, where he was born, April 21, 1794. And that childhood was in harmony with the whole life. With nothing precocious or remarkable, he seems to have been always thoughtful and sedate, showing from the first a determination to become a minister, and exercising his gifts in writing and preaching at a very early age. Having been placed for a short time under the tuition of Rev. Dr. Allyn of Duxbury, he removed to Cambridge with the family in 1805, when his father was appointed Hollis Professor in Harvard College. Soon after he lost a mother, who inspired in all her children an affectionate reverence, and left a permanent influence. Though but eleven years of age, he wrote in verse his thoughts and feelings on this event, and shows the effect of it in other allusions at a later period. Continuing his education at Cambridge, and for a year at Andover, he entered Harvard College in 1808, and was known at once, not for great scholarship or striking talent, but for the quiet devotion to duty, the gentle and serious demeanor, and the unaffected piety, which distinguished him through life. In his Senior year he taught a public school in Beverly; and young as he was, entering diffidently upon his first trial in circumstances not the most favorable, he yet made an impression which the writer of

this notice found to be vivid and delightful nine years after, when called to the charge of the same school. Graduating with honor in 1812, he became an Assistant in the Academy at Exeter, beginning at the same time his theological studies, and after two years returning to Cambridge to complete them. In 1815, at the age of 21, he began the work for which he had always longed, and from which his affections were never turned to the end of life, — the work of a minister of the Gospel.

And here we would speak of a prominent trait in the character of Henry Ware. He was strictly and most consistently, by choice, principle, fitness, and unreserved devotion, a *minister*. That which many assume from mingled motives and with various aims, he assumed, or rather accepted, as if no other occupation had ever occurred to him, and no other object could ever divert him. No other ever did. To the ministry first, to the ministry most, to the ministry as above all other claims, he devoted his life. Other objects engaged him, but none inconsistent with this, none that superseded it, or made it even secondary for a moment. Every high and worthy cause awakened his interest, and received some share of his attention, but never to the forgetfulness of his calling, or the neglect of one of its duties. Few men have done more than he for the many social, moral, and philanthropic movements of the day; yet who has done more for the ministry of the Gospel? Not only did he carry the spirit of the Gospel into every other work, showing their relation and aiming to extend their reciprocal influence, but he gave himself first and most to the direct work of the ministry itself; and whether as a preacher, or the former and helper of preachers, he allowed no other object, however worthy or grand, to come into competition with the claim and work of the Gospel. For peace, temperance, freedom, benevolence, education, theology, the spread of the Bible, the influence of the Lyceum, he spoke, and wrote, and labored; but not a mind in the community, we venture to say, ever identified him with either of these, or forgot, or supposed him to forget, the character and office of the Christian minister. There was a time, and the Memoir discloses some of its trials, when most of his friends feared that one cause, that of the slave, was engrossing too much

of his mind, or might lessen his general influence. But at that very time, he was regarded by those to whom the condition of the slave was the first, if not the only pressing interest, as lukewarm and unfaithful, because of his independent position and higher devotion to the great object of his life. That object was still, and always, the Christian ministry. To this he gave the best service of all his powers. To this he made everything bend. In talking, in reading, in journeying, in health and sickness, labor and rest, his heart seems ever to have turned to this, and his thoughts and prayers were given it when he had nothing else to give. It was affecting to see him, after the springs of life had been touched, and the silver cord was loosed, reviving at the very mention or thought of this work, kindling as he spoke, and pouring out the fervor of his struggling spirit in behalf of the cause for which he still longed to live and labor. It was his life; and it never ceased but with life, or rather ceased not at all, but only changed its sphere. We regard it as the source of his strength, and the secret of a success, which his powers did not lead him, if they did others, to expect. If any think that this intense devotion to his work, so various in its efforts, so unsparing and fatal, should be a warning, let them also reflect, that his unswerving devotion to the supreme object amid all other pursuits, and the singular power it gave him, should at the same time be an example and an encouragement.

In the Memoir, at page eighty-third, there is a remarkable paper, written by Mr. Ware a few months before he began to preach, and marked on the envelope — "To be opened and read for improvement, once a month." It shows a habit of severe self-scrutiny and a sense of deficiency, such as may shame many and animate all. His first preaching was not distinguished, and seems to have left only the impression of a devout and fervent spirit. He soon however received an invitation to settle over the Second Church in Boston, and was ordained the 1st of January, 1817. There he remained nearly thirteen years; and though most of them were marked by weakness, if not illness, and several times he was wholly disabled, it is safe to say, that few ministries of any duration or vigor have witnessed a greater amount of labor, a more entire devotion to spiritual interests, or larger and richer results. There were singular

contrarieties, or at least diversities, in the character and power of his ministry. Naturally inclined to indolence or a sort of self-indulgence, he was an indefatigable and disinterested laborer. With multiform engagements and ceaseless demands upon his time and thought, he was never in haste. No man had more on his hands, no man was more ready to engage in other and all good work. Of calm and often cold exterior, he was ever glowing with tender and intense feeling. We know that some found him repulsive; to us, and to many, he had a power of attraction and impression possessed by very few. We seldom entered or left the presence of Channing, without a sentiment of awe; we seldom entered or left the presence of Ware, without a sentiment of gratitude. Yet there were times when both these sentiments changed places. Both were closely allied, and so were they who caused them. Men more separated by circumstances and habits, with greater unity of spirit and power, do not often meet in the same city and ministry. It was our fortune once to see them brought together in a relation and manner deeply affecting. As we were sitting with Mr. Ware in his desolate room just after the death of his wife, Dr. Channing came in to offer his sympathies. Such a comforter, with such a mourner! Few and calm were the words uttered, deep and delightful the impression left.

Having touched upon the character of the mourner, writing as we feel rather than by method, we may refer to other facts, which help to show him as he was in the family, and as he could not be known to all. Those who knew him only as a public man, or even in private as the professional man, may have little idea of his domestic character. It is one of the few points in which the Memoir can be thought deficient, that it fails to present him fully as the man of sentiment. That he made no display of feeling, is saying little. That he sometimes concealed it, so as to appear almost insensible when his whole soul was melted, we know. His sensitiveness to the power of music and poetry, his love of nature in all her forms and the profound awe he felt at her sublimer aspects, the silent tear that started at the call of humble suffering and of moral heroism, the ready sympathy in both the joys and sorrows of childhood, revealed to intimate observers a nature, which common

appearances seldom asserted and sometimes denied. And there was an intensity of emotion under his own sorrows, together with a calmness and cheerfulness, which disclosed to us as much of the Christian, as all besides. In proportion to the calm depth, was the humility of his grief. Had he a more remarkable trait than his humility at all times? When God's hand was upon him, it was indeed affecting. He did not love to speak of it, but so strong was the feeling, that in some of his letters in seasons of affliction, he would say — 'What must I be, to *need* this chastisement?' When we have stood with him at the bed of his dying boy, and heard the brief, calm, uplifting prayer of more than submission, rising in those tremulous tones, the moment the spirit departed, we have felt a power, which all public demonstrations might have failed to reveal to us. And then the simple and beautiful trust which he shows, not long after, connecting this death with the first that occurred from among the many who met in that joyous family-gathering described in the Memoir (p. 373.) It was a child that went first, and thus he writes in his letter of sympathy. "One can almost fancy that he has been called up to the company of those that were gone before, to tell them all about it: — why might not some one come back to tell us of them, and to say who should be summoned next? There is a goodly number there already, and the new cherub will not find himself amongst strangers. Methinks I see him now, taken by the hand of one of them, *perhaps it is Robert*, and led forward to his place, wondering and happy!"

If children remain children in heaven, we need no fancy, but only faith, to conceive of the welcome which *he* found, when he joined that company above. There was a reality in his connection with children, which should also go to make up a complete idea of the character. We have known no one, who entered more entirely into the happiness of the young, or contributed to it more generously. With the pen, with the tongue, with the joyous song, the humorous sport, the hearty laugh, he became a perfect child, the happiest of the happy. Little poems, droll stories, cunning charades, prodigious and most laughable fancies — there was no limit to the ingenuity, variety, and ease, with which he promoted the joy of the playful hour. And yet

in a manner, which made the power of his moral presence, his smile or soberness, his encouragement or reproof, all the greater. The fountain of his humor, deeper and more gushing than some could imagine, was as pure as it was full. Did ever child or man breathe a word of impurity in his presence? The sportive word was always welcome, when in its place; if out of it, it met a different response. He has somewhere said of himself, that he seldom laughed; but there was a heartiness in his laugh worth a thousand of empty sound. Indeed mirthfulness was a part of his nature. Would that we could show it as it appears in many of his letters, and in some well-remembered scenes; for it goes far to explain to us the power, which his character as a whole, and especially his most unrestrained presence, exerted over us. The verses to Mr. Ingersoll from Port Kent, and a few other passages in the Memoir, intimate something of this, but cannot tell half. Weakness and illness seldom checked, often seemed to quicken, this vein of humor. He indulged it when he could do nothing else, for his own or others' comfort. And again, in his best and busiest hours he gave time and strength to the most juvenile work, such as would gratify or instruct. The original copy of Robert Fowle he *printed* with his own pen, for one of his children; and many other stories of less extent. In a letter written from a sick room, after naming a number of pleasant books he has been reading, showing anything but idleness, he says — "So you see how the lassitude and good-for-nothingness of a sick chamber lead to waste of time;" and then adverting to the plans of labor he had formed and must now postpone, he adds — "I could cry, if I ever cried." We dismiss these little incidents, trivial we will not call them, with an allusion to his Sunday evening instructions of his own children. With the setting sun, he would call them together, and ask each one for a hymn, talk of their Sunday lessons, and encourage them to question him, which they did freely. Then taking a Scripture story, he would tell it in his own language, pointing out the moral, and fixing the attention of the youngest; and as a conclusion, they would all sing a hymn, his rich bass chiming in beautifully with their childish treble.

We have been speaking of character, without reference to time. But the power of such character in a minister, this

ready sympathy with the young and old, the grave and the cheerful, is undoubtedly one explanation of Mr. Ware's unexpected and unusual success in his ministry in Boston. It was there we left him, and so long as he remained there, until prostrated by illness, he was constantly gaining in the confidence and love of all, and in peculiar influence with many. In the last years of his ministry, he is believed to have stood higher in the regard of all classes, and wielded greater power, than any individual in that city. Yet was there never the slightest appearance of adulation on the part of the community, or conscious elevation in himself. A favorite with all, he was the idol of none. We attempt in vain to recal an instance, in which there has been such high reputation and universal acceptance, with so little panegyric. And this itself is the best distinction. To possess a character which commands admiration but repels flattery, to exercise a power in the pulpit which makes every one think of himself and the truth more than of the speaker, to win the tender and confiding affection of many hearts, with such absence of effort and disregard of appearance as to seem to a common observer indifferent and frigid; still more, to do all that he did in all ways, and leave the name he has, with no trait or talent remarkable and prominent to every one, — shows a rare combination of mental and moral powers. His own people felt it deeply. And when his ill health compelled him to ask to be released from duties which he could not discharge, they would not "give him up," but provided a colleague, and relieved him of all care. Soon after, he was appointed Professor in the Theological School at Cambridge, with permission to go abroad for health, and with generous provision by friends at large for all the wants of a traveller. He accordingly sailed for England in April, 1829, and returned in August of the next year, having given these sixteen months to recreation and varied acquisition in different countries of Europe. He enjoyed much, and suffered much. Health and vigor did not come as he hoped, and, under the effect of exhaustion and disappointment, he had seasons of depression unusual for him. No wonder. Far from home, separated wholly from what he so loved — labor and usefulness, with the prospect of going back to a life of lingering weakness and idleness, and many anxieties pertaining to

others, we only marvel that he bore up as he did, that he saw and learned so much, and came home to enter at once upon the arduous duties of an untried place, with high expectations awaiting him, and little strength to meet them.

In the autumn of 1830 he removed to Cambridge, and there spent twelve years in the Professorship of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. The office was made for the man, and the man for the office. It was the ministry still, and its chief object was the aid of the ministry. Therefore he loved it. He brought to it the results of experience, a furnished and ever active mind, glowing but always tempered zeal, and a full heart. He could not fail of success, and he did not. The voices of those who were under his care, the usefulness of many since, and the unqualified sentiment of the whole denomination, if we may not comprise many more, testify to the fidelity, the arduous labors, and the influence of this period of his life. It was an important period. With the ministry in Boston it makes the whole of his public life, and these two periods, nearly equal, are the marked divisions. How short were they, compared with many other ministries; yet how long do they appear, when measured by the thought of all they accomplished! They covered just a quarter of a century, during which occurred the greatest changes and most important events, by which Unitarian Christians in this country have been effected. And now, in looking back, does the eye discern one figure or agency so inseparable from the whole, so efficient in originating, promoting, and controlling, so relied upon for energy and discretion combined, so busy with pen and voice in every province and good work, and withal so true to his own calling, unobtrusive, quiet, spiritual in his influence, as Henry Ware? This may seem eulogy, and had we not often heard it expressed by others, less partial and better able to judge, we would not say it. But we believe there is no individual, with whom more minds have identified the progress and power of liberal principles, or the prevalence with them of an evangelical spirit. His own spirit was always evangelical, and he breathed it into the minds and ministry of not a few of his pupils, and of his brethren everywhere. The Gospel was his law; he owned no other, he would sanction no other as equal. Christ was to him authority;

to this alone he bowed, and he could ill brook any rival authority, whether of dogmatism or liberalism. With a spirit of independence and charity not easily surpassed, he was unequivocal in the adoption and immoveable in the defence of the word of God, the sufficiency and supremacy of the Gospel of Christ. He frankly advised more than one young man not to preach as a Christian minister, if he could not preach Christ, above all other teachers. Yet who associates narrowness, timidity, or intolerance, with Henry Ware? The most withering rebukes we ever heard him utter, were for the intolerant of his own name. In those of other names, whose faith in some instances seems to require this spirit, he condemned it less, and checked those who were disposed to condemn it loudly; but in his own friends, he could not spare the egregious inconsistency and sin. If he ever forgot his charity in the least, it was in that hardest of all exercises of this virtue, patience with the uncharitable. In regard to the name, the doctrine, the promotion of Unitarian Christianity, he was open, fearless, and most diligent; but we have reason to think, that he felt more, or at least said more, of the faults of his own system, than of any other; while we are sure, he never questioned the piety or did injustice to the merits of any. It was often said, by those who misrepresented alike him and the faith in which he gloried, that he was no Unitarian, as is said of all who are suspected of piety; and we rejoice that they are so many.

The influence that he exerted as a teacher at Cambridge, was spiritual more than theological. His spiritual power was felt, not only in the School, but in the College, where also he had duties; preaching in the Chapel, instructing the undergraduates for a time in Paley and Butler, and inviting them to religious conferences. He attempted indeed to be not a preacher alone, but in some measure a pastor to the University, that he might reach the affections and individual wants of the students, in ways which many suppose impracticable. Yet even this limited and broken effort accomplished enough, to show that something could be done with full strength and the opportunity of perseverance. For him, there was neither strength nor opportunity. A crowd of duties in different departments, such as no man of even iron strength should undertake, engrossed his whole time, and

soon undermined the feeble frame. Again and again had he been brought down, through his whole life, but again and again had rallied and risen. He was never hale, often nerveless; but he worked on, he formed new plans, he engaged in new duties, he aided every good object, he was consulted more than any other man by younger ministers, and applied to by destitute churches, until at last that which had been averted beyond all expectation, came upon him, — he was prostrated, and compelled to resign every trust. In 1842, he left Cambridge with his family, and retired to Framingham, where he lingered in varying health and hope for more than a year, full of plans still, but unable to execute them, alive to the enjoyment of friendship and nature, cherishing fond hopes of action and usefulness, suffering keenly from disease and disappointment, but calm in faith and with bright visions, to the end. The end came on the 22d of September, 1843.

The end! We like not to connect that word with any Christian life, surely not with his. It is one of the lives, with which it is most difficult to associate death in any form. We find ourselves, when we think of him, repeating the words which he once used in expressing his poignant grief at the loss of a loved friend: — "It is a strange feeling, that never lasts; for ordinarily it is just as if she were still living." We see more of Henry Ware, not less, now that he is gone. That common experience of the power of death to bring out the life and reveal the whole man, is peculiar here. Apart from the spiritual view, we find new proofs of the magnitude of his work. His nearest friends were not prepared for the amount of materials and plans which he left behind. And many are surprised, of those who thought they knew him well, to find in the Memoir how much he attempted, and how much accomplished. We have here a list of more than a hundred and fifty publications, separate or in periodicals, in every form of composition, and every department of life. In biography alone, we find sketches of Eminent Philanthropists, notices of Emlyn, Goodier, Abbot, Howe, Priestley, Oberlin, and Howard, with larger Memoirs of Parker and Worcester, and the "Life of the Saviour." For the "Sunday Library," and the "Scenes and Characters illustrating Christian Truth," he had extended plans, comprising over twenty

different subjects, or rather classes of subjects, pertaining chiefly to biography and history. Indeed his published writings give no idea of the variety and amount of his productions, planned or partly executed. Nor can we attempt to give an idea. Prose and verse in every form, from the most grave to the most playful, literature, science, religion, narrative, song, child's alphabet, child's prayer, sacred drama, mathematical lecture, besides all the usual forms of professional labor and public service, make an incalculable amount of material, and show at least a wonderful fertility and industry. They show more. They bear almost uniformly the character or the aim of *usefulness*. That word, as has been well said, defines, if one word can, the prevailing feature of his writings and object of all his efforts. But it was a usefulness that had little affinity with common 'utility,' still less with that popular term which to him was offensive — 'expediency.' Seldom has any one labored so much for present want and immediate use, yet with so large and high an aim. Few have done more for the reforms of the day, with such independence of party and faithfulness to principle. No writer has contributed so much, probably, to all the periodicals of the denomination; to no one, certainly, are we more indebted for the origin and success of our religious associations and benevolent efforts. And all this, it will be remembered, with health constantly interrupted, often entirely prostrated, and with scrupulous fidelity to the duties of an arduous profession. He did too much. He attempted enough to task and break the stoutest frame. His own, always frail, bore up with astonishing power for a longer period than any expected, but failed prematurely still. The lesson is to be heeded. In this, if in anything to the eye of man, he erred. Yet who that knew his temperament, the demands made upon him, and all the circumstances of his life, will be the reprover?

We shrink from any attempt at strict analysis or formal description of character. Beside that others did this sufficiently at the time of his death, and the closing chapter of the Memoir embodies much of it, it is less needed than in most prominent cases. No one who knew Henry Ware, will ask to have him described minutely, and we doubt if any who have only read what he has written, require to be informed of his leading traits. The transparent simplicity,

directness, and truthfulness of his character, none mistook in seeing, reading or hearing him. It may be that no one ever thought of his greatness — it must be that no one ever doubted his goodness. Has there been at any time a better instance of the *power* of goodness, not only by itself and upon others directly, but by its influence upon all the faculties, and its agency in producing that harmony of parts, concentration of effort, steadfastness and elevation of purpose, which leave a mark upon the age, such as genius seldom leaves, and common greatness never approaches? With no precocity or early prominence, with no peculiar adaptation or preference for any one branch of study — unless his self-consecration to the ministry be so regarded — with an entire absence of system, and frequent departure from his own rules of mental pursuit, if he formed any, always subject to innumerable and diverse cares, always harassed by infirmity, and fearing utter prostration, — how was it, that he accomplished what he has, that his name stands for so much to so many minds, that his affections, reserved and ever calm, made their way to so many hearts, and that he has left so precious a memory in the community, as teacher, benefactor, and friend? It was by the singleness of his devotion to good ends. It was by the union of qualities, scarcely one of which was distinguished apart, but all of which created a beautiful and powerful whole. It was by an enlarged and enlightened interest in all classes and causes of humanity, with unwavering fidelity to the paramount cause of truth and Christ. It was by firm adherence to his own convictions, with determined justice to others, and the freest charity for all. It was by the forgetfulness of himself alone, in toiling, through life and unto death, for the ignorant, the neglected, the destitute, the intemperate, the hostile, the enslaved, the old in error or sin, the young in innocence and peril. It was, in brief, by the Christian combination of qualities and forces usually separate, and often thought incompatible; gentleness and boldness, freedom and caution, enthusiasm and judgment, active zeal with meek charity, the poet's fire and the preacher's calmness, the reformer's and martyr's spirit with the patience and forbearance of the most practical and humble laborer.

Henry Ware has described "the man of the Beatitudes."

Has he not portrayed himself? He has given us beautiful, and now familiar lines, on "Seasons of Prayer." His life was prayer. Devotion was an element of his soul, and some of his most moving eloquence was in its private and public expression. One of his last employments, after he was stricken, was to compose some prayers for families, in which the "young" might feel that they had a part and an interest. His doctrine of prayer was absolute faith in God, not only as hearing but answering; and in Christ, not as a teacher alone, but as a sympathizer and intercessor. We never talked with him on this subject, we might almost say we never saw him, that we did not find our own faith confirmed. We know not whether his public or private power, his speaking or his silent presence, affected us most. We know only that no speech or silence ever moved us more than has his, and by no life or death have we been more blessed.

With reluctance we leave this pleasant task. It has been to us another interview with one dearly loved. We loved Henry Ware with an affection altogether peculiar; and we speak of it the more freely, because we know it was shared by so many. It is one proof of the singular power of his character, that with so little *expression* he could create such deep and tender love. Is it not felt by multitudes, who have little knowledge of him, except through his life, preaching, and writing? What a place did that life fill in the community, and in the affections of men! What an influence did that preaching and writing exert! And to how many in this country and England will the Memoir go, and find grateful welcome! It carries two portraits of him — imperfect likenesses. It carries his life and letters — and there is the man. Never was a man more visible in his letters. He wrote as he felt; — no effort, and with near friends no restraint. He wrote easily in everything; in letters most rapidly, as without thought yet full of it, now serious and now ludicrous, lavish of sentiment and figure, in English or Latin, prose or poetry. We have letters with not a word of English, and others all in irony — showing the greatest readiness, and amazing versatility. But we speak of his letters here with a single object, to which we have not referred. Many of them show him in the *filial* relation, and bring before us also those inval-

uable letters of his father. Their correspondence gives us a beautiful picture of both. And if no other picture is to be granted us of that venerable man, we do wish that more of his letters to his children could be published. We know their worth, and we know how many they would gratify and bless.

The father has joined his son. They are again together, enjoying an intercourse dependent on no earthly medium. But they are not removed from earthly communion or human affections. Our reverence and love are with them, and their benediction is constantly descending. They both passed away in gradual and unconscious death. They both live in a life that we may share now, and share forever. It was said by one who witnessed the death of the younger —"Tranquilly did that spirit pass, and the peace of heaven settled at once upon that beloved face; such an expression of repose and rest, such a return to youth and its hopeful anticipations, was depicted in it, that it seemed indeed a type of the new birth of the spirit in that new existence which it had just commenced." With that existence Henry Ware is now familiar. Many has he helped to enter it, and many he is helping still. Long will his words come to us — those words, especially, that conveyed through a brother one of the last messages of his life — and come with a power that goes to fulfil their prayer: — "Peace and love to the brethren!" E. B. H.

Art. IX. — RELIGIOUS LIFE OF ENGLAND.*

The age, it is said, has become "historical." It is gathering up the fruits of the past history of the race. It is not content with brushing away the dust from old monuments, retracing half effaced inscriptions, gazing at mere facts — the outward, visible life of humanity. It deals with analysis — keen, searching analysis. It has grown philosophical. It is looking at the significance of facts rather than at facts

* *A Retrospect of the Religious Life of England: or the Church, Puritanism, and Free Inquiry.* By John James Tayler, B. A. London, 1845. 8vo. pp. 563.

themselves, — at their revelations of the interior life of thought and feeling. It collects, arranges, compares, only to get at the hidden meaning or principle. It treats the past as the chemist treats the substances subjected to his examination. It applies tests, it uses the crucible, till it is made to yield up its subtlest spirit or essence. Dr. Dryasdust has his place and office, indispensable ones too, but not the highest in the province of intellect and humanity. Without our Dryasdusts we could not have our Carlyles, who help us to look through the outer garment into the very soul and heart of humanity itself, bring up the "heroes" of the past and cause them to talk to us face to face, write "French Revolutions" and "Cromwelliads." The historian now condenses, generalizes, lays open elementary laws. He may sometimes refine and theorize too much, may occasionally torture the past to make it utter the right word, may by a Procrustes process reduce it to the measure of his system. We think Michelet at times chargeable with this fault, yet what living pictures glow on his pages. History under such a pen becomes instinct with life and soul; it is no longer a mere heap of dry sticks.

The age, we said, is historical, philosophic, analytic. This feature of it appears in Mr. Tayler's book. It is a book for the times, just such a work as the age demanded, and so far as the subject is concerned in some sort new. We know of no one who has treated the subject before him, at least in the same way, for we cannot consider the occasionally subtle analysis, and few glimpses of great principles and of the elementary life of religion, found in Maurice's "Kingdom of Christ" as contributing much to the elucidation of the past "religious life of England."

"Retrospect of the religious life of England," — to the thoughtful, few themes can be more pregnant and kindling. What images crowd on the mind. What voices come up from the past, in that land where our fathers had their homes, — voices, indeed, not always sweet, nay, sometimes harsh and grating, driving out some of her noblest sons, compelling them to leave the sepulchres of kindred and ancestors, and seek a refuge and "freedom to worship God" on the wild shores of the New World. Yet without a knowledge of the religious history of England we cannot understand our own; and both as descendants of the Pilgrims,

and as Christians, we regard this volume as a most valuable gift sent us by our friends on the other side of the water. The work proves conclusively the rare qualifications of the author for his task; and the manner in which he has executed it places him at once among the acutest and most successful writers of the age. We have not for a long time read a book on which we can bestow heartier commendation. Mr. Tayler possesses, we think, peculiar powers of generalization and nice and profound analysis; and though, in a very modest preface, he speaks of the "inadequacy" of his "materials" for fully developing his "idea" or leading principle, his acquaintance with the facts of the past appears sufficiently intimate and extensive to secure him against any important error in his results; and he is certainly a clear, discriminating, fresh and animated writer, capable, we should say, of rising to strains of no ordinary eloquence. He writes, too, in a delightful spirit. There cannot be one particle of bitterness in his nature; he is no narrow sectarian, no mere partisan, no bigot; and they, who may find it necessary to dissent from some of his opinions, will still give him credit for vigor and acuteness of intellect, while they honor the nobleness of his nature and his evident love of truth.

As the work has not been reprinted among us, we shall be somewhat liberal in our extracts, for which we doubt not we shall receive the thanks of our readers. The design of the work is thus stated in the preface.

"The idea which possessed my mind, when I first sketched out the plan of this volume, was the desirableness of embracing in a common point of view, the phænomena of the different religious parties, whose unintermitted strife and sharp contrast of manners and opinions, have given such a deep and varied interest to the spiritual history of England, especially during the three centuries which have elapsed since the Reformation. In pursuing this idea, I have tried to discover the governing principle and understand the characteristic working of each party — to apprehend their mutual relation — to shew how they have occasionally passed off into each other — and out of their joint operation, to trace the evolution of a more comprehensive principle, which looks above the narrowness of their respective views, and, allying itself with the essential elements of the Christian faith, may in time perhaps devise some method of reconciling an unlimited freedom and variety of the religious

life with the friendliness and mutual recognition of universal brotherhood." — Preface, pp. iv, v.

The author finds, in the history of religious parties in England, three distinctly marked periods: first, "that of Lollardism — the name given in the fifteenth century to the disciples of Wycliffe — extending from the reign of Edward III. to that of Henry VIII.; secondly, that of proper Puritanism, from the Reformation to the extinction of the Commonwealth on the restoration of Charles II.; thirdly, that of Protestant Dissent, from the Restoration to the present day." In these different periods he discovers only "different manifestations of a common principle, tempered by the condition of society and the vigor of opposing tendencies."

"In the ensuing pages," he tells us, "an attempt has been made to discover the distinctive principles, and contrast the effects on our national mind and character, of the English hierarchy and of Puritanism — to exhibit their mutual relation — and to trace out of their joint influence the evolution of a third principle, distinct from each — that of free religious inquiry." — p. 10.

We pass over his section on the "external history of religious parties in England," which of necessity presents only a rapid "sketch" embracing prominent principles and incidents, and come at once to his chapter on the "Church." During the reign of Henry VIII., little change was made in the constitution of the Church, except what necessarily resulted from "dissolving the connexion with Rome, and transferring the ecclesiastical supremacy to the Crown." Articles, however, were framed, explained and illustrated, for fixing the national standard of faith and worship, and a small catechism was issued "by royal authority," called the "King's Primer." An Act was passed for "abolishing diversity of opinions" in religion, called the "Six Articles," which was, "in fact, a re-enactment of the old religion, hailed with joy by all who were averse to the progress of the reformation." The public service of the Church, with some few exceptions, was still conducted in Latin. A Liturgy was set forth, founded chiefly on the "Use of Sarum," but in many churches the Roman breviaries and missals continued to be used as before. The King gave his sanction to an English translation of the Bible, but by an Act of 1542, the reading of it was prohibited to all "under

the degrees of gentlemen and gentlewomen;" and the King himself declared that "the reading of the Old and New Testament was not necessary to the laity, but that liberty or restraint in this matter must be referred to the laws and government." The whole is thus summed up by Mr. Tayler.

"At the close, then, of Henry's reign — notwithstanding the separation from Rome, and notwithstanding the strong Protestant tendencies of Cranmer — the Mass was still celebrated in Latin; the authorised confession of faith differed in no essential particular from the ancient creed; and the papal canons were still in force: — in other words, the Church, though it had changed its head, was in doctrine, ritual and discipline, as Romanist as ever, and much less free." — pp. 58, 59.

During the short reign of Edward VI., the Reformation advanced. Homilies were published, the "Six Articles" were repealed, and the injunction to set up the Bible in the churches, "accompanied now by a translation of Erasmus's paraphrase of the New Testament," was renewed.

"Their next object was to draw up a Book of Common Prayer and other devotional offices. That the establishment of a form of public Service should have preceded the publication of articles of faith — so contrary to the practice of the continental Reformers — is a significant fact in the history of the English Church, and was owing to the caution of Cranmer and the judgment of Ridley, who thought it desirable to reconcile the bulk of the nation to the changes that were proceeding in religion, by the use of a liturgy not too widely divergent from the forms they were accustomed to, before they set forth a public declaration of belief. It is said, that Cranmer had prepared a Service of a more decidedly Protestant tone, but that the Romanist influence was too powerful in the committee charged with the business, to admit of his procuring its adoption. Many of the more zealous Protestants and the Calvinistic Reformers generally (though there were exceptions) disliked a liturgy; and the course taken by the divines of Edward's time, while it conciliated numbers who were attached to the old religion, distinguished the Church of England by a broad external sign from the Reformed Churches of the Continent, and has had a lasting influence on its constitution and character. In the composition of the Prayer Book, a respect for antiquity and established usage — characteristic from the first, of the measures of the Anglican Reformation — largely predominated. A great part of it was translated from the Latin of the previous Catholic Service, enriched by selections from the ancient lit-

urgies of the Gallican, Spanish, Alexandrine and Oriental Churches." — pp. 62, 63.

Edward's first Service Book was issued in 1549: some revisions afterwards took place, chiefly at the instigation of foreign Protestants, by which it parted with something of its Popish character, but in its essential features it remained unchanged. After some account of the origin of the Thirty-nine Articles, which, as well as the Homilies, Mr. Tayler pronounces Calvinistic, though the Church itself has been often, we believe we may say for the most part, Arminian, he thus states the "general characteristics of the Anglican Church."

"Such, then, are the elements which enter into the composition of the Church of England, as exhibited separately in its Prayer Book, its Discipline, and its Articles. It remains to inquire, what has been their operation, combined as an organic whole, and viewed in the course of their historical development. — How shall we express the individuality which has marked the Anglican hierarchy, since it acquired a fixed character and subsistence, and which still distinguishes it from other religious societies? — If I mistake not, we find its distinctive attributes in a certain assumption of national independence and ascendancy, kept in check by the power of the State, and often greatly neutralized by the influence of enlightened and moderate men within its pale — but still manifesting itself, when circumstances have thrown it forcibly back on its inherent tendencies, and allowed it free scope for action, — in a spirit of domination and exclusiveness — in a haughty and aristocratical bearing, fitly represented by its episcopal constitution — which betrays equal impatience of the foreign jurisdiction of the Pope, and of democratic pretensions at home. Herein we discover the reason of its reluctance to acknowledge the Protestant Churches of the Continent, and of its instinctive aversion from the popular elements entering so largely into the movements of the Reformation, to which those Churches owed their origin. Such tendencies may no doubt be ascribed in part to the circumstances of a wealthy and powerful establishment, but partly also they have their source in the spirit of the Prayer-book itself, and in the very nature of episcopal government, for they do not entirely cease, where, as among the Episcopalians of Scotland and the United States, the peculiar influences of an establishment are wanting. The Church of England displays the kind of pride which belongs to an ancient lineage, and has many sympathies with the recollections of feudalism. She claims a high descent and the prescription of a long-established title; and, while

exulting, in the very spirit of the old baronial independence, at the thought of having cast off a foreign yoke, and purged herself free from the grosser corruptions of Popery, she holds herself aloof with an air of conscious superiority, from the sects of more recent origin that have rapidly shot up into consequence at her side. She takes her stand on the principle of authority; for, although in the fundamental charter of her reformed constitution, she appeals to Scripture for her right, she nevertheless authoritatively defines the sense of Scripture, and in her practice forbids any one to dispute it." — pp. 84–86.

The sections which treat of the "High Sacerdotal and Regal Doctrines and Prevalence of Arminianism under the Stuarts," of the "Influence of Low Church Principles after the Revolution," and of what the author calls the "Modern Period," embracing the eighteenth century, Methodism, and the Puseyite movement which has its root in the past, deserve an attentive perusal, and had we room would furnish some good extracts. In the retrospect of the history of the Anglican Church, the author finds demonstration of the "utter inutility of Creeds, Articles, and a settled form of Prayer, to preserve agreement in belief, or even harmony of feeling, among its members."

We proceed now to Puritanism. "Absolute freedom of inquiry," Mr. Tayler considers as "one of the latest results of advanced intellectual culture." It is rather the consequence of Puritanism than one of its essential and characteristic features.

"The fundamental idea of Puritanism," says he, "in all its forms and ramifications, is the supreme authority of Scripture, acting directly on the individual conscience — as opposed to a reliance on the priesthood and the outward ordinances of the Church. To realise the standard of faith, worship and conduct, recorded in Scripture, has ever been the object of Puritanism; and to attain that object, in defiance of a hierarchy, requires no small degree of self-reliance and decision of purpose. But with Puritanism the range of inquiry is shut up within the limits of the written Word; it does not venture to sally forth beyond them, and survey the Scripture under a broader aspect, from some point of view external to it. Where, as in the case of Baxter and some others of a later period, the principle of rigid Scripturalism was less firmly grasped, they approached the confines of the Latitudinarian system, and ceased, to that extent, to be proper Puritans." — pp. 131, 132.

Again,

"The sufficiency of Scripture is the fundamental postulate of Puritanism; the authority of the Church, the ground practically taken by the Anglican hierarchy: and these incompatible assumptions have been the cause of the unintermitted strife between them, through the last four or five centuries of our history. Scripture — the record and depository of the free and popular spirit of the primitive Gospel — the Magna Charta of religious liberty — is a standing witness and protest against the pretensions of spiritual despotism. In the spirit which it breathes, we find a reason of the ardent attachment to it ever manifested by those, who at different periods have struggled against episcopal tyranny and called aloud for ecclesiastical reform — from the African sectaries who resisted Cyprian and were persecuted by Augustine, down to the Waldenses, the Hussites and the Lollards of the Middle Ages; and in the same spirit we detect a motive for the efforts of the priesthood to keep the dispensation of the Word of life in their own hands, and prevent its free circulation among the laity. The conflict pervades the whole of Christian history, and goes back to the first ages of the Church. If mere antiquity could decide the question at issue, Puritanism, through its authentic representatives from the earliest times, might at least make out as venerable a pedigree, and establish as clear a line of apostolical descent, as Episcopacy. Taking the word Puritanism in the large sense which has been explained, we may trace the identity of the principle, in all its most striking manifestations, through every period of its history, whether oppressed by a Catholic, or in collision with a Protestant, hierarchy. Under all outward changes, we shall find, that Scripturalism, a severe morality, popular sympathies and warm attachment to civil freedom, have constituted the sign and peculiar distinction of Puritanism." — pp. 133, 134.

The writer passes in rapid review "Lollardism" and Wycliffe, the "Incipient Puritanic Movements" under Henry VIII., "High Presbyterianism under Elizabeth," the "Qualified Presbyterianism at the close of the sixteenth, and in the first half of the seventeenth, century," and comes to "Independency, and the more Extreme Forms of Puritanism."

The origin and progress of these are exhibited in a lucid style, with a happy selection of incidents and illustrations, so far as the object of the work requires or admits. In the interval between the Restoration and the Revolution, the "character of the Puritanic movement underwent a change." The "influence of distinguished teachers on the historical

development of Puritanism" during this period is illustrated by some very well drawn sketches and portraits.

"The men of this period form the transition-class between the old Puritan of the time of the wars, and the Protestant Dissenter recognised by the Toleration Act of the Revolution. With them we are immediately connected, through the foundation of our religious societies, and the possession at this day of many principles and tendencies which they have transmitted to us. The memory of our great-grandfathers reaches back to the time when their personal influence was strong and active in the world. They are our spiritual ancestors — the fathers of English Protestant Dissent. This was the period that witnessed the painful ministry, the prolific tongue and pen, the severe and saintlike virtue, sweetened with a holy meekness — of Baxter, Owen, Bates, and Howe in the metropolis — of Heywood, Fairfax, Newcome, Henry, and Flavel in the provinces — men, who lived on their convictions, and giving themselves up, like true prophets of God, to the inspirations of faith and duty, fulfilled amidst all the disquietudes of a troubled and persecuted life, with court and priests and magistrates against them, — the solemn vow they had laid on their souls, to preach, at whatever cost, the truths of eternal life to sinful and dying men." — pp. 222, 223.

Of Baxter, Mr. Tayler thus speaks: —

"Of the great Presbyterian party, Baxter stands forth as the most conspicuous representative. I have already explained, that the term Presbyterian — as the name of a party — had ceased to denote exclusive attachment to that form of Church government, but embraced all who were not from principle Separatists, and who desired a national settlement of religion, on the broad basis of purification and reform. In this aim, Baxter heartily concurred; to promote it was the governing principle of his ecclesiastical and doctrinal system. He shunned extremes, and sought a common centre; and, in this respect, his mind was essentially eclectic. His chief ground of difference with the Independents was, in his own phrase, 'their separating strictness.' Under the guidance of this principle, Baxter's mind became more tolerant, enlarged, and catholic, the longer he lived. Its distinguishing attributes were uncommon vigor and acuteness, delighting almost to excess in the exercise of dialectic subtlety, great fervor of spirit, simplicity of purpose, and inflexible honesty. Though he had not the advantage of an University education, he was deeply read on the subjects that were then conceived to belong to divinity, and would have had a higher reputation for learning, had he written less. But the pen was scarcely ever out of his hand, and of his voluminous productions,

the far greater part were occasional, and thrown off at a heat for some immediate practical object. In the noble earnestness of his character, he thought less of literary fame, than the interests of the human soul." — pp. 223, 224.

Baxter began as a strong Calvinist, but his opinions afterwards became much softened, and he "fixed his attention chiefly, the older he grew, on rectitude of heart and practical goodness;" he believed that "the points at issue between Calvinists and Arminians did not so involve fundamental truths, as to be necessary grounds of separation;" his views of the Trinity were charged with "deficiency in clearness and precision," and his "own later exposition of them took the form of Sabellianism." "Sometimes in the silence of his study, yearning after reality and usefulness, he longed for the adventurous life of a missionary, that he might be no more wearied with words, but grappling with facts, go forth and preach the Gospel to the savage and the heathen." His spirit and example exerted a deep influence on the next generation of Nonconformists.

"Belonging to the same party, but with a character less ardent and earnest, and of manners more gentle, complying and polished — were Bates and Howe."

"A man of a different stamp, — more profoundly learned in theology, of an intellect more severely consequential and rigidly dogmatic, but less open, genial, and comprehensive, — was Dr. Owen, the celebrated leader of the Independents. The Congregational system had been supported by some great names before his time, but his numerous writings, high reputation, and great personal influence, gave it form and character, and impressed upon it the peculiar features of his mind, as Baxter left his on Presbyterianism." — p. 232.

Owen received repeated marks of favor and confidence from Cromwell, whom he accompanied into Ireland and Scotland, and in 1651 was appointed "Dean of Christ Church and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford." He was once a member of Parliament, was zealous in defence of the Commonwealth, and "himself raised a troop of horse at Oxford." He declared against Cromwell's assumption of the title of King, after which a "coolness grew up between them."

"After the Restoration, Owen, of course, shared in the general disgrace and discouragement of the Puritan party; but having a considerable private estate, he lived in comparative ease

and comfort, exposed only to occasional annoyances, and enjoyed the protection and countenance of many persons of rank and influence. Clarendon himself was in the number of his friends. His church in Berry Street was attended by some of the old Commonwealth officers, Fleetwood and Colonel Desborough. Dissatisfied with the state of things in the old country, he was at one time preparing to emigrate to New England, where he had been invited to undertake the presidency of Harvard College; but he was prevented by an order from the Council. A similar invitation he had received from Academic bodies in Holland. He died in 1683, on the anniversary of the ejectment under the Act of Uniformity." — p. 234.

"The character and principles of Owen present in several respects a marked contrast to those of Baxter. Each had his own decided view of the great questions of religious truth and liberty in which they were both, with equal piety and earnestness, engaged; and when the grave had closed over Owen's remains, Baxter paid a hearty and generous tribute to the distinguished worth and endowments of one who had been his frequent opponent in life. Owen's Congregational principles, though involving by necessary consequence a toleration of different forms of worship and Church government — at least among Christians — rather tended to encourage narrow and rigid terms of communion within the limits of each particular Church. 'None,' says he, 'but those who give evidence of being regenerated, or holy persons, ought to be received or counted fit members of visible Churches; where this is wanting, the very essence of a Church is lost.' Baxter, on the other hand, abhorring separation, and aiming at nationality, would have taken in all quiet and visible Christians, that did not break in on the established Church order, from the Papist on one side, to the Socinian on the other. Spiritual purity — freedom from all heretical mixtures — was the essence of a true Church in the view of Owen; comprehensiveness was its outward sign and recommendation, in that of Baxter. Owen disapproved of worshipping in the national churches; Baxter never withdrew from their communion, and only recurred occasionally to the use of separate assemblies, as a necessity that was forced upon him against his will. Baxter, as he advanced in life, approached nearer in his views to Arminianism; Owen retained his Calvinism to the last. Baxter shrank from a very decided assertion of the Trinity; Owen stood forth in his 'Vindiciæ Evangelicæ' to confute the Unitarianism of Biddle. Baxter was for amalgamating all parties; Owen, on the contrary, was a great promoter of the Savoy Confession, which coming after the labors of the Westminster divines, could only have the effect of marking off the Independents as a distinct body from the Presbyterians. Baxter

interpreted the Bible with a breadth and freedom of view, and a continued reference to the priority and supremacy of the Spirit, which bordered on the theology of Fox and Barclay. Owen was rigidly Scriptural; so that, when Brian Walton published his Polyglott, he was alarmed at the bold views put forth in the prolegomena and appendix, respecting the original text, and vindicated its purity and integrity in a treatise, 'Of the divine original and authority of the Scriptures.' Owen was profoundly skilled in the theology of his age and school, and had communed much with his own heart, and narrowly watched the manifestations of the religious life in close spiritual intercourse with various members of his own Church; Baxter had warmer sympathies with general humanity, and read its indications with a more open and excursive eye. Baxter had great simplicity of character and directness of purpose; while Owen combined with remarkable spirituality of mind, a larger share of shrewd caution, knowledge of affairs, and worldly depth and penetration, than usually falls to the lot of a student and divine." — pp. 235–237.

"We trace the different principles of the two men, in the divergent tendencies of the Presbyterian and Independent sections of the old Puritan body, of which they were respectively the heads. The Presbyterians were always hoping for comprehension; the Independents were satisfied with a tolerated separation. The former always associated the cause of civil, with that of religious, liberty; the latter were led by their principles to keep the ideas of Church and State more distinct, and to overlook sometimes, in a tendency towards extreme spirituality, their reciprocal action and dependence. Among the Presbyterians, the constant movement of opinion was towards Arminianism and its related doctrines; among the Independents, we witness an effort in the contrary direction, to uphold the primitive Calvinism. We may look on Owen as the founder of rigid, and Baxter of moderate, Dissent." — p. 238.

Turning over some pages relating to the Anabaptists and Quakers, and the "Rise of permanent Nonconformist Societies," we come to the chapter on the "Church and Puritanism contrasted." We wish we could afford some extracts on this subject, which is treated with discrimination and thoroughness. We offer no apology for the length of the following passage on the influence of Puritanism on literature.

"The influence of Puritanism is often represented as hostile to elegant literature. Its short-lived ascendancy, beset with danger and consumed in strife, had indeed little leisure for the soft dalliance of the Muses. But the sublime incarnation of its

spirit in the poetry of Milton, must forever repel the imputation of incompatibility with the very highest form of literary excellence; and even its homely, popular, expression in the pregnant allegory of Bunyan, yielded nutriment to the national heart, at least as wholesome and generous as the banter of Hudibras, which was the delight of the reinstated Royalists.

It is a curious speculation — not so remote from the present subject as to forbid a moment's entertainment — what might have been the effect on the subsequent development of our literature if the triumph of Puritanical principles under Cromwell had been lasting, and prevented the Restoration. Twice in the course of our history has our native literature — the spontaneous growth of the Saxon element which is so widely diffused through our population, and forms the very heart of our national character — been submerged beneath a foreign influence breaking in upon it from France. The earliest poetry of our nascent English — if we except a few songs and ballads circulated among the lowest classes — was in its form, its spirit, and for the most part even in its materials — essentially Norman. Chaucer and Gower wrote for the court and the nobles — not for the people. Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the genuine English spirit rose into influence, and strengthened by a continual accession of popular elements, in which religion had perhaps the largest share, brought forth in little more than a century and a half an exuberance of literary fruit, whose rich juice and racy flavor proclaim it the unforced produce of our native soil. Within this period sprang up our national drama — that breathing expression of English life. To it belong the greatest and most original of our authors, uniting a wild fertility of imagination, as yet unbroken by criticism, with a masculine strength of thought — the fathers of our eloquence and poetry — Spenser, Shakspeare, Milton, Hooker, Raleigh, and Bacon. With whatever party in Church and State they may outwardly be classed, these noble minds are thoroughly English in feeling, and instinct with the spirit of progress and mental independence. Their works announce that redundancy of moral and intellectual energy, which, craving after some higher good, but not at one with itself as to the form and measure of it, at length broke out into action and spent itself on civil discord. The movement in this direction ceased with the expiration of the Commonwealth. On the return of Charles, a second inundation of French influence overwhelmed our manners and our literature. The poetry of 'the blind old schoolmaster,' John Milton, was forgotten; the drama of Shakspeare, Massinger, and Fletcher, true to nature and humanity, whose last echoes died away in the feebler genius of Otway — was replaced by the rhyming tragedies of Dryden; and the soul of native inspiration which breathed in

our ancient song, expired under the fetters of art imposed on it by a Parisian criticism.

This change could not have occurred had Puritanism maintained its ascendancy. Milton would have become the immediate model of imitation, and his influence must have introduced a severer taste and a purer tone of sentiment. At the same time, his scholarlike feelings and healthful mind would have preserved from the ignorant contempt and destruction of fanatical zeal, the precious remains of our older literature. Even under Puritanical rule, the mind of England would doubtless have been gradually affected by the progress of European ideas: — but the very different relation in which we should then have stood towards France, must have prevented our writers from taking her classical productions as a standard of excellence; and Dryden and Pope — in the form at least which their genius actually assumed, and with the influence which they exerted on the literature of the Revolution — could not have existed. Their vigorous and polished couplet, embodying sharp epigrammatic contrasts of thought, and their inimitable art of reasoning in verse — so well adapted to a cold and satirical cast of mind, and the effect of reaction against an over-strained enthusiasm — were never, however, in perfect harmony with the latent sympathies of the people; they floated over the surface of society, but did not penetrate to its living depths." — pp. 284 – 287.

We must here somewhat abruptly, from want of space, terminate our notice of this interesting volume, which we regret the more, as the remaining chapter relating to "Free Inquiry" leads us over a rich and varied field. We can only indicate some of the topics which are, with greater or less brevity, treated in it. They are — the distinction between the independence of religious societies and the freedom of the individual mind; different elements of religious freedom evolved during the seventeenth century; re-action against the doctrines of the first Reformers; rise of latitudinarian principles; effect of philosophical theories and scientific discoveries; first school of English Unitarianism; influence of the writings of Locke; Dissenting academies; character and position of Doddridge; English deism; influence of Hartley's philosophy; revival of Unitarianism by Priestley; Orthodox dissent; Channing; influence of Germany; powerful organization of Independency. We part with Mr. Tayler with many thanks for a volume from which the public will derive both pleasure and profit, and in the hope of being soon permitted to renew our intercourse with him through some other work from his pen. A. L.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Extent of the Atonement, in its Relation to God and the Universe. By THOMAS W. JENKYN, D. D., President of Coward College, London. Second American, from the third revised London edition. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1846. 12mo. pp. 266.

The Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church in the Conversion of the World. By THOMAS W. JENKYN, D. D., Author of "The Extent of the Atonement," etc. First American from the second revised London edition. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1846. 12mo. pp. 304.

THE first of these volumes would amuse us as a curiosity, were it not matter of sorrow rather, to witness so signal an illustration of the power of theological system or prejudice in warping the intellect, and perverting or confounding all its conceptions of right and wrong. "Atonement," whether we regard etymology or Scriptural use, means, as every tyro in theology knows, reconciliation. Not so, however, does Dr. Jenkyn define the term, but thus: "Atonement," says he, "is an expedient substituted in the place of the literal infliction of the threatened penalty, so as to supply to the government just and good grounds for offering and dispensing pardon to the offender;" that is, is "substitution," — as the author applies it in the case of Christ, "a substitution of his person instead of the offenders; and a substitution of his sufferings instead of their punishment." All this as an "expedient" to satisfy the claims of "justice" and "sustain the interests of moral government!" This is the old "Governmental theory" as it has been called, but which will not do for this nineteenth century. How long, we may ask, could human governments stand, if administered on such a principle? And how long will theologians continue to abuse the patience of the public, and set at defiance all the laws of common sense and sound biblical criticism, and shock our moral perceptions and our reverence, by the utterance of such absurdities? Truly may the author say that the "sufferings of Christ," thus viewed, "were perfectly novel in the universe," and that they "posed and amazed all angelic intelligences." Well they might.

The *influence* of the "atonement" the author does not regard as confined to man, but as extending through the universe, natural, it would seem, as well as moral. Thus the title of one of his chapters is, "On the atonement in its relation to all the works of God," that is, as he explains it, the "whole universe."

He says, "Nature, providence, and grace, then, are three immense wheels in one machinery, — the cogs, and revolutions of each, catching and influencing those of the others, and all put in motion by the great atonement." All true science, then, for ought we see, must be regarded as founded on the "atonement." "There is no class of truths," he affirms, "which may not be either proved or explained by the principles of the atonement." "There is not a truth pertaining to God and man, to eternity and time, but is connected with him," that is, Christ. "In him all truths live, move and have their being." Further, in reference to the extent of the atonement he says, "the intelligences of other worlds are positively benefitted by sharing in the blessings" of it. "God has no medium, no way of blessing any being, in any world, but the mediation of Christ!" As if Dr. Jenkyn knew anything of God's government of other worlds. What miserable presumption! In conformity with this view he calls Christ, with sufficiently questionable taste, "the President of the universe," — the "great President," — and speaks of what the "illustrious President of the universe himself has said." Still worse, in point of taste at least, he tells us that "in his official character, Christ is the Receiver General of all the revenues of God's immense empire." Again, "it is his work, as the public officer of the moral commonwealth, to present to God all the reverence," etc. We want words to express the disgust with which such language fills us. It shocks every sentiment of reverence for the Saviour. It pains us to observe that a book of this character, after having gone through three London editions, should have arrived at a second edition in this country. Alas for the popular theology when it is fed from such channels.

The volume on the "Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church," is in our view far less exceptionable, and though tainted with a remnant of the old scholastic theology, portions of it contain sound views, which we recommend to the special attention of those who are accustomed to regard the Divine spirit as working by "fits" and "impulses," or in any way "arbitrarily," or "irrespectively of means." L.

Walt and Vult, or The Twins. Translated from the Flegeljahre of Jean Paul. By the Author of the "Life of Jean Paul." Boston: J. Munroe & Co. 1845. 2 vols. 16mo. pp. 320, 311.

It is with much diffidence that we express our regret, that the graceful and efficient powers of the translator of these volumes had not been applied to some other work. Not that we think the "Flegeljahre" unworthy of being translated. That would

express more than our meaning. We doubt not that Jean Paul knew his public very well; that he wrote for their entertainment and instruction; and we know that there was very small chance of his writing for those objects otherwise than successfully. He was not likely to fail in any literary enterprise which he undertook in earnest. But as he sat quietly composing this work in Coburg, he had before his eye, not the literary circles of Boston, Philadelphia, or London, but of Leipsic, Weimar and Göttingen. It is impossible that a book of this character, so dependent for its interest on a knowledge, on the part of the reader, of events and characters local and transient, of minor habits of thought and expression, of national peculiarities and current by-words, that such a book should not suffer prodigiously, by being transferred to another intellectual climate and to a foreign soil. Add to this the loss that works of humor and satire always must sustain by any, even the best translation, — such as this is, — and it will not appear strange that "Walt and Vult" should be laid down by many persons with a feeling of disappointment.

The work itself, in its design, is an ample illustration of Richter's pet idea, — the painful disparity between the loftiness of man's, especially a poet's ideal, and the meagreness of his attainments; between the boundless aspiration of his faculties, and the wretched poverty of his acquisitions; between the breadth and magnitude of his purposes, and his miserable failures in fulfilling them. It is indeed a noble and a solemn theme. It is worthy the power and pathos of the most inspired genius. In this particular instance, however, we cannot possibly see why a true poet might not combine something of the intellectual elevation, pure fervor, and meditative wisdom of "Walt," with a respectable share of that knowledge of the world and address in society, which appears in "Vult." Both belong to humanity, and we do not believe they are necessarily disjoined. Literary history affords distinguished examples of their harmonious union. Need poets and prophets be simpletons, or simply ridiculous? — This work is marked by Jean Paul's characteristics, — a vivid perception, a broad reach of vision, a various culture, an affluence of imagery, sometimes fanciful, a genial sympathy with all forms and departments of life, and the capability to make them serve his artistic ends. He enters so heartily into his subject, and writes so eminently from a love of writing, that it is difficult to conceive that he could ever have been under the necessity to make books for bread. Notwithstanding what we have said here, we believe, and are happy to believe, that these volumes are welcomed and read by a large class of persons with unqualified interest.

H.

A History of Music in New England. With Biographical Sketches of Reformers and Psalmists. By George Hood. Boston: Wilkins, Carter & Co. 1846. 16mo. pp. 250.

Memoirs of a New England Village Choir. With Occasional Reflections. By a Member. Third edition. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 18mo. pp. 152.

The Messiah; an Oratorio, composed in the year 1741. By George Frederick Handel. Boston: Wilkins, Carter & Co. 1846. Fol. pp. 188.

The first of these volumes contains a history of old psalmody in New England, rather than of music. Indeed the author says, the "history of music in New England, for the first two centuries, is the history of psalmody alone." The title of the work leads the reader to expect too much, and most persons probably will lay down the book with a feeling of disappointment. It can make no claim to artistic excellence; it contains, nevertheless, much curious matter — many choice gleanings from dusty records, for which the author will receive the thanks of those who take an interest in the religious history of New England. Rude indeed was the old singing from Ainsworth's Version and the Bay Psalm Book, which were used through the greater part of the first century, and in many churches to a later period. What would our modern congregations say to singing "at one standing" a Psalm of 130 lines, occupying sometimes half an hour? Some scrupled to sing anything but David's Psalms, while some objected to singing them at all in "these days of the New Testament," thinking it ought to be left to the members, who had "received a Psalm from the enditement of the Spirit," to sing, the others saying Amen at the close. Another question was, whether women, as well as men, might be allowed to sing; another, whether it should be permitted to any but "Church members;" and another still, "whether it be lawfull to sing Psalms in meeter devised by men," or "uninspired tunes." These and similar questions were discussed with no little warmth in the early days of the Colonies. Very uncouth was the Church music of those days, if music it could be called: and it went on declining till about the year 1720, when a strenuous effort was made to reform it. This was difficult, for many contended for the prevailing custom of "lining out" the Psalm, as it was called, by the deacon, and also for singing "by rote," which for many years had been the only mode. Some of the objections made to "singing by rote" are amusing enough: — it was "a new way, an unknown tongue" — it was "not so melodious as the old way" — "it was Popish" — it "would introduce instruments" — the "names of the notes were blasphemous" — and finally, "it was needless, the old way being good enough."

Many cases of conscience came up; pamphlets were written, and sermons preached and published, and the whole community was, for the space of ten years or more, thrown into a state of the greatest ferment. Rev. Mr. Walter says of the singing of the day, it sounded "like five hundred tunes roared out at the same time." — But we are exceeding our limits, and must conclude with observing, that unskilfully as the volume is put together, and defective as it is in many respects, it yet does something to fill a void in our ecclesiastical history, and we should rather thank the author for what he has done, than complain that he has not done more or better. The work must have cost him much labor.

The Memoirs of a New England Village Choir, the first edition of which appeared several years ago, may not be known to all our readers as the production of one whose ministry has long kept him at a distance from New England, but whose graceful pen records the impressions of early life with equal sprightliness and fidelity. The charms of this pleasant piece of fiction — if such it must be called — need no commendation of ours. It is enough to announce a new edition.

The Oratorio of Handel is a reprint from the latest London edition, by Bishop, in which the "vocal parts are given complete, and the most important of the instrumental parts (including those added by Mozart)." Of the merits of the "Messiah" it might be presumptuous, and it would certainly be superfluous, for us to speak. We only wish to draw attention to this (second) American edition, which does credit to the typographical art among us. L.

Martyria: A Legend, wherein are contained Homilies, Conversations, and Incidents of the Reign of Edward the Sixth. Written by WILLIAM MOUNTFORD, Clerk. London: J. Chapman. 1845. 16mo. pp. 368.

WE had, some months ago, prepared a short article on this volume, the contents of which first appeared in the "Christian Pioneer," published at Glasgow, and had marked some pages for extract; but other matter, which pressed for insertion, has necessarily excluded it, and we must now content ourselves with a brief notice. The "Legend" has little regularity of plan, the narrative being in a great measure subordinate to the sentiment. It purports to refer to "early Unitarian Times;" and looking at modern Unitarianism simply, one can hardly deny the claim of the reign of Edward VI., between the years 1547 and 1553, to be so called. There was then, in truth, a great deal of Unitarianism. Thought was more free than afterwards, when the doc-

trines and discipline of the Church had been settled by authority. Orthodox writers take notice of the spread of Unitarianism and of the alarm it occasioned, and violent methods were adopted to suppress it. The honest Strype speaks of these methods as "more rugged than seemed agreeable to the principles of the Gospel;" but, he says, they were "thought necessary," Arianism "showed itself so openly and was in such danger of spreading farther." "Rugged methods," indeed, they were, and Joan Bocher, called also Joan of Kent, and in the "Legend," Jane Bouchier, was one of the victims. She, says Fuller, in a passage, which a spirit so humane never should have penned, "with one or two Arians were all who, and *that justly*, died in this king's reign for their opinions." Enough surely in a short reign of six years.

Such were the "early times" of English Unitarianism referred to in the "Martyria," and undoubtedly in the main features truly represented. Fiction, indeed, is often truer than history, as it more vividly pictures out the times to our imagination. But this is far from being the sole, or chief merit of the work. It contains many passages of a calm, meditative beauty and kindling devotion, which can hardly fail of calling forth an answering note in the soul of the reader, — many passages marked by no ordinary purity both of thought and expression. The interest is not equally sustained in all parts of the volume, yet there is little of it we should be willing to spare. Its tone is throughout cheerful and healthy, and few, we think, who read to be made better, or who delight in devout sentiment without cant, will begin the book without a desire to finish it.

Since the above notice was in type we have learned with pleasure, that an American edition of the "Martyria" is about to be issued by Messrs. Crosby & Nichols. We doubt not that the volume will meet with a ready and extensive sale. L.

Confessions of an Early Martyr. By Mrs. H. V. Cheney, Author of "Sketches from the Life of Christ," etc. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 18mo. pp. 141.

This little volume, though juvenile in its aspect, and not unsuited to the capacities of the young, may be read by persons of mature age with interest and profit. Even those most intimately acquainted with ecclesiastical history will find it, not only deeply impressive, but useful in reviving their recollection of important facts. Fictitious in form, it is true to history in substance, and presents a picture, at once vivid and accurate, of the perils and sufferings to which converts to Christianity were exposed, among the Romans, in the latter half of the first century. We know

of no other book, of so small a size, to be compared with this, as to its fitness to convey forcibly to the mind an adequate idea of the almost incredible hazard and cost, at which men and women, belonging especially to the higher ranks of life, exchanged the Pagan for the Christian religion, in the earliest age of the Church. Are there any in our day who fancy their sufferings from persecution extreme? They may learn, perhaps to their advantage, from the few pages of this work, that martyrdom now is not precisely what it was in the reign of Nero. B.

Studies in Religion. By the AUTHOR of "Words in a Sunday School." New York. 1845. 18mo. pp. 230.

Questions adapted to the Text of the New Testament. Designed for Children in Sunday Schools. With Hints for explanation and remark by the Teachers. Number One — Matthew. By C. SOULE CARTEE, one of the Superintendents of Harvard Church Sunday School, Charlestown, Mass. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 18mo. pp. 99.

The Teacher's New Year's Present. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 24mo. pp. 48.

THE first of these books contains twenty-four "Studies," or essays, six of which are in verse. The prose is better than the poetry, and the sentiment and thought of both are better than the style. The "Studies" seem to have been designed to be read to an advanced class in a Sunday school; though we cannot think that many young persons would be found capable of understanding them well enough to enjoy or to be greatly benefitted by them. What, for example, could a young reader make of such a sentence as the following? "Conviction, that thought, sentiment, principle, is supreme, is the sent of God, always leads to the *lying down* for their sakes, of passion and interest and ease,— but such sacrifice alone gives divineness to life, and when the outward is vanquished, that which survives is seen to be the son of God." Still, the author has evidently, besides a lively imagination, a thoughtful and speculative mind; and displays considerable originality. The book is suggestive, and embodies many fine thoughts.

The object and plan of Mr. Cartee's "Questions" strike us very favorably. The Introduction contains valuable suggestions to Sunday school teachers, particularly with respect to the use of the New Testament. The author declares it to be the design of his book, "to make the young better acquainted with the sacred text itself." Clear and judiciously selected questions are proposed, for the children to answer in the words of the Evangelists. Prefixed to each question is the number of the verse in which

the answer is to be found, and appended to the series of questions upon each chapter is "a section for the teacher, pointing out some of the most prominent words and phrases requiring explanation, and suggesting topics for reflection and application." The Sunday school teacher will find this, we believe, a useful book.

The "Teacher's Present" is a compilation of poetical pieces, with an original introductory letter to the children of the Sunday school connected with the Bulfinch Street church. Attractive to those for whom it was prepared as a token of their pastor's kindness, it may also be interesting to others. The selections are, generally, well adapted to please and improve the youthful reader. It strikes us that there may be one objection to the book, we mean a too frequent use of the subject of *death*. In our opinion it is neither wise, nor right, to give so much prominence as is often done in children's books to this theme, or to use it so freely for the purpose of making serious impressions upon the young mind, and calling forth the sympathies of the tender heart. Harm may, insensibly, be done in this way to children, and wrong to Christianity. R.

Onward! Right Onward! By Mrs. L. C. Tuthill, Author of "I will be a Gentleman," etc. Second Edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 169.

The Boy of Spirit. A Story for the Young. Second Edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 18mo. pp. 117.

The Lost Wheelbarrow and other Stories. By Anne W. Abbot, Author of Willie Rogers, Kate & Lizzie, etc. Boston: S. G. Simpkins. 1846. pp. 172.

We have an opinion of our own, as to the kind of books it is most desirable that children should read, which forbids our believing that the highest standard of excellence is so often reached in this department of literature, as many seem to suppose. It affords us pleasure, nevertheless, to commend every attempt, that is in a good measure successful, to furnish the young with works which are at once interesting and instructive. Among the volumes which, in our view, possess more than ordinary merit, we class the three, whose titles are given above.—"Onward! Right Onward!" by Mrs. Tuthill, is a tale, which few persons, whether old or young, will begin without reading through. It abounds in forcible and pathetic sketches of the evils resulting from pride of genius joined to instability of purpose and strong feelings, together with delightful illustrations of a wise and affectionate sister's power to reclaim a wayward brother from wrong courses. Perhaps the book would have been more useful to common

readers, had "Fairy Feza" not been quite so faultless, and if her brother "Herbert" had been less frequently hurried, by his ruling passion, to the extreme of offensive behavior.—"The Boy of Spirit" appears to have been written with the best intentions; and we are pleased, in general, with its style. Its object is to discourage that impatient, rash, and quarrelsome disposition, which so many regard as indicative of a noble nature, and to win love and respect for the opposite qualities of character. The story, we think, is well suited to accomplish the end which the author had in view. It contains two suggestions, however, that seem to us of at least doubtful tendency; one, in the first chapter, apparently commendatory of "James Adair" for saying to his master, "I cannot tell," when requested to give the name of a vicious boy who had perpetrated a crime in school; the other, near the close of the book, where, in the account of "Frank Pierson's" sudden death-bed repentance, reference is had to "that stream which could make his sins, though scarlet, white as snow."—The volume by Miss Abbot contains four stories, "The Lost Wheelbarrow," "The Dance of the Mice," "Little Horace," and "Honest Cuff," which, though not of equal merit, are all told in an easy and natural manner; and the moral impressions they produce are of the best kind. We would suggest to this lady, who, by her manifest love for children and intimate acquaintance with their habits of thought and feeling, as well as by her general intelligence and sound judgment, seems better qualified than most writers to supply the wants of juvenile readers, whether her tales would not be more effective for good, if they were so composed as that each, instead of being very miscellaneous in character, should have for its chief end the enforcing of one great truth or the producing of a single valuable impression. B.

An Address at the Funeral of the Hon. Thomas A. Davis, Mayor of Boston, delivered in Central Church, on Tuesday, November 25, 1845. By JOHN PIERCE, D. D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline. Boston. 1845. 8vo. pp. 24.

Do Justly. A Sermon preached at Dorchester, on Sunday, Dec. 14, 1845. By NATHANIEL HALL, Pastor of the First Church. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1845. 8vo. pp. 16.

A Word for Peace. A Christmas Discourse. By WILLIAM H. FURNESS. December 25, 1845. Philadelphia. 1845. 8vo. pp. 14.

Peace the Demand of Christianity. A Sermon preached in the South Congregational Church, December 28, 1845. By F. D. HUNTINGTON. Boston: L. C. Bowles. 1846. 8vo. pp. 24.

The Idea of a Christian Church. A Discourse at the Installation of Theodore Parker as Minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Church in Boston, January 4, 1846. Delivered by HIMSELF. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 39.

The Comparative Importance of Foreign and Domestic Missions; including Statistics of Education, Philanthropy, Crime, &c. in Albany: A Discourse, preached January 7, 1846. By HENRY F. HARRINGTON, Minister of the First Unitarian Society in Albany. Albany. 1846. 8vo. pp. 30.

A Sermon delivered before his Excellency George N. Briggs Governor, his Honor John Reed, Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the Annual Election, Wednesday, January 7, 1846. By GEORGE PUTNAM, Minister of the First Church in Roxbury. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 31.

Discourses delivered on taking leave of the Old Church of the East Society in Salem, December 28, 1845; *and the Dedication of their New Church, January* 1, 1846. By JAMES FLINT, D. D., Pastor of the East Church. Salem. 1846. 8vo. pp. 48.

A Lecture on the Origin and Development of the First Constituents of Civilization. By FRANCIS LIEBER. Columbia, S. C. 1845. 8vo. pp. 18.

An Address on the Annexation of Texas, and the Aspect of Slavery in the United States, in connection therewith: delivered in Boston November 14, *and* 18, 1845. By STEPHEN C. PHILLIPS. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 12mo. pp. 56.

Fragments of Medical Science and Art. An Address delivered before the Boylston Medical Society of Harvard University. By HENRY JACOB BIGELOW, M. D., President of the Society. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1846. 8vo. pp. 54.

Harvard College and its Benefactors. Boston: Little & Brown. 8vo. pp. 37.

Letter of the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers, to Rev. John Pierpont, with his Reply. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 16.

A Letter to the so-called "Boston Churches," which are in truth only Parts of One Church. By a MEMBER OF THE SAME. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 8vo. pp. 24.

A Letter from the Hollis Street Society, to their Unitarian Brethren, with the Documents relating to a recent call of a Minister, by that Society. Published according to a vote of the Society. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 40.

THE funeral Address by Dr. Pierce embodies his own personal recollections of the childhood and youth of the late Mayor, gives a brief sketch of his life and character, and is an affectionate tribute to the memory of an upright and good man.—The

claims of justice, in its various applications in the conduct of business and in the relations of social life, are treated in Mr. Hall's Sermon with a simplicity and directness, which we should be glad always to find in the instructions of the pulpit. — Mr. Furness's Christmas Discourse administers a severe rebuke to the spirit of war which prevails in the seats of political influence, and is timely as well as firm in its vindication of Christian principles.—Mr. Huntington, too — as did most of our preachers, we suppose, at the season of Christmas — sounds a peace note, glances at the consequences of war between this country and Great Britain, and utters an animating word for all, who are looking forward with "hope of yet happier days."—Mr. Parker's Discourse gives an exposition of his views of a Christian church and its action, "first on its own members, and then, through their means, on others out of its pale." Setting aside what is peculiar in the writer's speculative theology, the discourse contains a great deal that is good and true; it is a plain-speaking and animated performance, mostly practical, though some censures are expressed or implied, about the justness of which, of course, there will be a difference of opinion.—For the topics of Mr. Harrington's Discourse we must refer our readers to the ample title given above, and content ourselves with saying, that it breathes throughout a spirit of ardent philanthropy, and that a portion of the statistics, that especially, which relates to the public schools of Albany, leaves on our minds a painful impression of the deficiences of the city.—Mr. Putnam urges the necessity of religion to the prosperity of the State, not on the old ground of the union of Church and State, nor on the ground of expediency, for religion must spring from a deeper source; it is not born of calculation; our fathers did not become Christians, that they might establish a "well-ordered-Commonwealth," but being Christians they founded it; and its prosperity depends on the continued prevalence of the Christian element in the hearts of the people. This idea is variously illustrated; the education of the young is referred to, and the topic of religious instruction in our Colleges is treated at some length, with special reference to the late discussions concerning Harvard. — Dr. Flint's two Discourses on taking leave of the old church are, as such discourses should be, historical, with appropriate reflections. That at the dedication of the new edifice passes by a happy transition from "material" to "spiritual renovation," and leads the thoughts up to the great object of Christianity, which is, in the highest sense, to "make all things new." The three are written in the author's usual easy and agreeable style, and form a valuable record of the religious society of which he is pastor.

Dr. Lieber denies that the elements of civilization have their origin either in instinct, or chance, in conscious action, or inspiration; they arise, he maintains, "out of the relation in which

man is placed to the material world." These points he argues at considerable length, and with some variety of illustration.—Though Mr. Phillips's Address, so far as intended to help in preventing Annexation, like the endeavors of many others, proved unavailing, yet both as a record of honest effort, and as containing much strong argument relating to the "political influences" of Slavery, and its connexion with our present Constitution, it will not only reward a careful perusal, but should be preserved among the documents to which by their character belongs a permanent interest.—The Address of Dr. Bigelow is rich in allusions to the methods and results of past scientific discovery, and endeavors to place theory and facts in their true relations, with special reference to medical study and practice. It is full of thought, and carefully written.—The ably written pamphlet on "Harvard College and its Benefactors" meets, and we think, successfully refutes the "two classes of complaints made against the College," the first arising from the assumption that the College is the "child of the State," and the second from the assumption of its sectarianism. Under the first head it is shown, that the benefactions of individuals to the College have vastly exceeded those made by the State, and yet five-eighths of the Board of Overseers are annually elected by the people, the State thus exerting a comparative weight of influence to which it is not entitled by the amount of its grants. The remarks of the writer on the second charge appear to us perfectly sound, and it is about time, we think, that the complaint of the sectarianism of the College should cease.—Mr. Pierpont having seen proper to submit to the public the correspondence which passed between him and the Boston Association of ministers, originating in their exercise of fraternal feelings at the close of his connexion with them, the public can judge of the spirit in which it was conducted.—The "Letter to the so-called 'Boston Churches'" is an attempt, evidently an honest one, to bring about a union between Christians — Trinitarians and Unitarians — on the common ground of holiness and love, or "a life of Christ in the soul, wholly distinct from the life of the world, which flowing into many spirits, makes them the true Church." They are true believers in Christ, it asserts, who adopt Peter's confession — "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." There is occasionally a little mistiness in its language, but it breathes a good spirit. — The Letter from the Hollis Street Society contains a statement of recent proceedings, made on behalf of "the Proprietors of the meetinghouse," with their letters to Messrs. Peabody and Fosdick covering an invitation to settle with them, the replies of those gentlemen, and the protests which a minority also addressed to them. We are glad to believe that an unhappy controversy is now brought to a close.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — Our readers will observe, on turning to our record a page or two further on, how large a number of ordinations and installations have taken place since our last publication. We already know that in May we shall have occasion to report several more. It is plain, that if in these days the pastoral connexion is too easily dissolved, our congregations are disposed to reestablish the ministry among them as soon as possible. We cannot but hope that the evil of brief terms of professional life, arising from frequent changes in the parochial relations of ministers, has reached its height, and that we may soon witness a return towards the old ways. We have been glad to notice that in one or two recent instances the ecclesiastical Council, called to introduce a minister to his charge by solemn religious services, have prefixed to the usual vote that they would proceed to such services, an expression of their regret that a condition had been included in the terms of settlement, by which the connexion between the minister and the people might be terminated by a simple notice to that effect given by either of the parties. A similar course pursued by other Councils convened for the same purpose might check a practice, which has been permitted to grow up among us, we are confident, without due consideration of its probable effects. — The last two months have brought fewer *removals* than usual within our knowledge. — Rev. Mr. Kingsley of Stow has resigned his connexion with the church in that place. — Rev. Mr. Barry, who, as we stated in our last number, was on the point of removing to Lowell to become the minister of the second Unitarian society in that city, has been obliged, by a return of serious physical indisposition, to relinquish all purpose of pursuing the labors of the ministry at present. — Rev. Andrew Bigelow, D. D., and Rev. Samuel B. Croft have become the successors of Rev. Messrs. Waterston and Sargent in the ministry-at-large, in connexion with the Pitts Street and Suffolk Street chapels in this city. — The congregation at East Boston which has been for some time attending on the instructions of Rev. C. A. Farley, has been legally organized, under the title of the "Unitarian Society of East Boston." — A new society has been formed at Mattapoisett, a seaport village in the town of Rochester, Mass. — A third Unitarian society has been gathered in the city of New York, under the ministry of Rev. Mr. Wellington, of the commencement of whose labors there we spoke in our last number. They hold their meetings, as we understand, in Grand street, in the Eastern part of the city.

Condition of Unitarianism. — Evidences multiply upon us of the spread of Unitarian opinions, and of the increased ability and stability of our religious societies. Besides the gathering of new churches, we hear of the renunciation of Trinitarianism by ministers who have

formerly been its public teachers. Several of our old houses of worship have been remodelled, or replaced by new and more convenient edifices. We especially rejoice to see that our congregations are taking advantage of the prosperous condition of the country, to relieve themselves of the embarrassment or inconvenience of debt. — The church at St. Louis, Mo., under the care of Rev. Mr. Eliot, have within the last year freed themselves from debt by a voluntary subscription of more than $8,000 for this single purpose. — The society in Montreal, Canada, of which Rev. Mr. Cordner is minister, have just raised by subscription from their own members $1,000, by which they have cancelled all their liabilities, except for the land on which their house stands, to extinguish which a sinking fund has been established, that will amount to a sum sufficient for this purpose when the prescribed time of payment arrives. — The Unitarian congregations in and about Salem, Mass., have united themselves for the purpose of sustaining missionary operations in Essex county, and have, in reference to this object, adopted the name of the "Fraternity of Unitarian Churches in Salem and Vicinity." It includes the four congregations in Salem, and those in Beverly, Danvers, Lynn, Marblehead, and Gloucester. We understand that Rev. Mr. Stone of North Beverly will be employed by them as a preacher in that neighborhood. — An Association of a somewhat similar character has been formed in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, the design and plan of which give promise of much usefulness. It has taken the name of the "Unitarian Association of the State of New York," and is meant to include not only the members of the congregations in those two cities, but the Unitarians of Fishkill, Albany, Troy, Trenton, Syracuse, Vernon, Rochester, and Buffalo, where regular societies exist, and any others of our faith in any part of the State. Zebedee Cook Esq., has been chosen *President;* Moses H. Grinnell Esq., *Vice President;* Messrs. P. M. Irving, George Ireland, S. J. Beals, Richard Warren, Seth Low, and W. H. Carey, *Directors;* William B. Allen, *Treasurer;* and James A. Cleveland, *Secretary.* The object of the Association is, in general, to promote the interests of Unitarian Christianity within the limits of the State; and the suggestions made in an "Address" which they have put forth, respecting the methods to be pursued for this end, show that the plan originated with wise and energetic men.—The first annual Catalogue of the Meadville Theological School justifies the officers of the institution in "congratulating its friends upon its flourishing condition." The three classes contain twenty-three students, of whom fourteen have entered this year. The Library "has been increased the past year by an addition of 900 volumes — making in the whole 1,400 volumes;" besides "800 volumes of text books; the use of which is given to the students during their connection with the School." The plan of studies is comprehensive, and the Professors are indefatigable in their attention to the classes.—The rapid sale which Unitarian books obtain is a circumstance to which we can also refer with pleasure. The first edition of Mrs. Dana's Letters on the Trinity, published last September and consisting of 1250 copies, has been sold, and the work is now in process of being stereotyped. The whole of the first edition of the Memoir of Henry Ware jr., by his Brother, consisting of 1,500 copies, has been exhausted in two months, and a stereotype edition on larger type is now in press.

Missionary Subscription. — The Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association have issued a "Circular to the Unitarian Clergy and People," in reference to the Missionary interest which was placed under their charge on the dissolution of the special Missionary Committee the last spring. This latter Committee was appointed in the year 1841, when an effort was made to raise the annual sum of $10,000, in addition to the former subscriptions to our various religious Associations. Some time elapsed before the Committee were able to perform the service entrusted to them, and but two years' subscription to the Missionary Fund was collected, when, on account of the inconvenience of a double organization, it was thought best to transfer the business of the Missionary Committee to the Committee of the Unitarian Association. With these facts our readers are probably familiar, though we do not recollect that they have been before distinctly presented on our pages. The "Circular," besides a forcible and timely appeal in behalf of "the cause of Missions," contains some statements which may not be so generally known.

"The collections of the first year exceeded somewhat ten thousand dollars, which was the sum proposed to be raised; and, in the second year, they amounted to over twelve thousand dollars; the sum total in the two years, being $22,665,90.

"Of these two collections, $15,321,80 have been transferred, in accordance with the special directions of the donors, to various societies and individuals throughout the country, by whom they have been disbursed; $3,083,12 have been distributed by the Board itself to the American Unitarian Association; $1,362,95 to the Evangelical Missionary Society; and $1,432,17 to the Society for Promoting Theological Education; — to be appropriated by each of them in fostering the particular objects to which their action is confined. The small balance of $1,340,32 has been expended by the Board in paying the salary and travelling expenses of the Agent, for missionary lectures, printing, postage and rent. Of the $15,321,80 specially appropriated by the donors, $12,226,51 were directed to be divided, in various proportions, between the three Societies above named.

* * * * * * * * * *

"With the desire of enabling the Association to maintain and increase its sphere of usefulness, the Missionary Board, in June last, dissolved its organization, — and transferred its books and papers, and with them the duties and responsibilities which had rested upon them, and which they had so ably and successfully sustained, to the Executive Committee of this Board. * * * But though this work has now passed into our hands, and will be henceforth conducted by us according to our best judgment and ability, no change has taken place in the plan originally proposed to be pursued. Yourself and all other persons in the denomination will be at liberty, as heretofore, to direct that the sums, which they may please to transmit, shall be appropriated for the use of the Evangelical Missionary Society, of the Society for the promotion of Theological Education, or of any other institution or object they may name; and they may rest assured that such direction shall be strictly complied with. At the same time, it may not be inappropriate to remark that this Association, from its position and the duties which necessarily devolve upon it, must be best acquainted with the religious condition and wants of all our institutions and of all sections of the country, and are [is] most likely to disburse the sums that they [it] may receive in such manner as shall effect the greatest amount of good."

We may in this connexion notice the last Annual Report of the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Indians and others in North America, from which it appears that $1,050 were appropriated the last year to missions at the West, and $500 "for the benefit of the Cherokee Indians," in aid of the mission and school which the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have established among them; besides other appropriations nearer home. The pamphlet before us also contains extracts from a very interesting Report made by Rev. S. K. Lothrop, who in June last visited portions of Michigan and Wisconsin, to ascertain what prospects of usefulness there might be, to encourage the establishment of missions by this Society "among the Indian tribes on our Western borders."

Unitarianism in England. — Our accounts of the condition of the Unitarian body in the United Kingdom are on the whole favorable. So great are the social disadvantages under which the profession of Unitarianism must be made in England, that we can expect only a slow increase in the number or strength of the congregations bearing this name. The progress and results of Puseyism have led the friends of the Establishment to a more active zeal in its behalf, while the prejudice of the Orthodox Dissenters against those who do not embrace what they are pleased to call evangelical doctrines finds no abatement. Unitarianism, exposed on either hand to hatred and opposition, may congratulate itself on any evidence which it may be able to furnish of growth or triumph over difficulties. Internal differences, too, tend to weaken the energies of the denomination. The same question which has been so freely discussed here — the value of historical Christianity — has given rise to two parties there, who, while they respect each other's characters and motives, find themselves unable to sympathize on some points of grave import. The Editor of the *Christian Reformer*, after alluding to the "agitation and division" which have befallen not only the Established Church, but every Dissenting denomination, as presenting "signs of the times such as to call forth in the Unitarians of England a bold and united effort for the advancement of their principles" as "the only cure for the obvious evils of the religious world," adds — "But alas! we too are divided, and have first to settle what truth is, before we can go forth an united band to confute error and rebuke intolerance."

Still we find ground of encouragement in the general aspects of the denomination. The passage of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill has been followed by the renovation, in several instances, of ancient chapels, for which the congregations were unwilling to incur great expense, while it was uncertain whether they should retain the possession. A late number of the *Reformer* gives a list of thirty-five "chapels that have been or are immediately to be rebuilt or repaired," at an expense varying from £70 to £5,000; two of which only are in Ireland — the others being all in England. Frequent communications in the *Inquirer* — the London Unitarian weekly journal, the circulation and influence of which, we are glad to learn, are increasing — show that a greater interest than was manifested in former years, is felt in the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. In the West of England, particularly, our friends seem to be animated with stronger purposes and to be engaged in giving more efficiency to their

labors in the cause of truth and righteousness. Willing to look facts in the face, they are bent upon infusing energy where there has been languor and depression. A Society has been formed under the title of "The Western Unitarian Christian Union," the object of which "shall be to promote the knowledge and practice of pure Christianity, and the worship of one God the Father, through his Son Jesus Christ, in the six Western Counties" of Gloucester, Wilts, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall. In the Address which the "Provisional Committee" have published it is stated, that the Society has grown out of a belief that "our views of Christianity have not of late years made such progress as might have been fairly anticipated. Congregations in the Western Counties, known by the name of Presbyterian, Unitarian, and General Baptist, are even fewer now than they were fifty years ago. In some cases our societies have continued to prosper, and their numbers have considerably increased; but in others there has been an obvious decline." The "Western Unitarian Christian Union" will "be connected with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, in accordance with the Rule requiring the payment of £5 per annum, and allowing two representatives to be sent to the annual meeting of the Association.

The support given to Unitarian journals, is a circumstance which we notice with pleasure. Besides the "Inquirer" to which we have just alluded, and which is edited with much ability; and the "Reformer," published monthly under the judicious direction of Rev. R. B. Aspland; and the "Prospective Review," the last number of which contains a long article on "Theodore Parker's Discourse of Religion," the writer of which, while in some points he differs from Mr. Parker, bestows upon him and his work the most sincere admiration; —a new periodical has been started in London, under the name of the "Unitarian," "designed to furnish the public with correct information of the principles of the Unitarian's faith." It will be published monthly, in 12mo. at the very low price of three pence, by Mr. Mardon. The "Bible Christian" of Belfast has been enlarged, and will in future appear under the title of the "Irish Unitarian Magazine and Bible Christian." It promises to give its readers a history of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, prepared by Rev. Dr. Montgomery at the request of the Remonstrant Synod. The Christian Pioneer, established by Rev. George Harris in 1826, and conducted by him first at Glasgow, and afterwards at Edinburgh, has been discontinued on account of his removal to Newcastle.

The death of Rev. Mr. Aspland of Hackney, after a long illness, has produced a wide sense of loss at his removal, and called forth many expressions of grateful remembrance of his services.

Ministry at Large. — This noble institution, the genuine fruit of Christian faith, is extending its benefits both in this country and in Great Britain. There are now four ministers connected with the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches in this city; — Rev. Dr. Bigelow, who labors principally in the North and West parts of the city; Rev. Mr. Cruft, who confines his visits chiefly to the poor at the South end; Rev. Mr. Burton, who has been employed for many months in collecting the statistics of Pauperism over the whole city; and Rev. Mr. Barnard, of the Warren Street Chapel, who devotes himself especially to the children in that neighborhood. — In Lowell the minis-

try at large, established by the "South Parish," has been conducted for more than a year by Rev. Horatio Wood, with great diligence and success. — In Baltimore, Md., Rev. Mr. Capen, whose first Quarterly Report has just appeared, has been invited "to continue his labors among the destitute of that city, as a missionary of the Board" of Trustees of the ministry at large. — Steps have been taken to establish a similar ministry in Portsmouth, N. H. — Other denominations are also prosecuting the work with industry and success. A very neat and commodious stone chapel has been erected in this city for the use of the Domestic Mission supported by the Episcopalians, of which Rev. E. M. P. Wells is the minister.

The Domestic Mission in London appears to have been conducted the present winter with unusual spirit. At Spicer Street chapel it has been thought best to have a course of Sunday evening "Controversial Lectures" delivered by different ministers, to remove the misapprehensions in regard to the faith of Unitarians, which were found to be impediments to the missionary's usefulness in that section of the city. A course of "Lectures to the Working Classes" has been given on Wednesday evenings, in the Temperance Hall, Milton street, by different scientific gentlemen, which has afforded much gratification to those for whom they were designed. On Christmas eve the children of all the Mission schools, to the number of four or five hundred, "most of them from abodes of dirt and wretchedness," were entertained at the hall in Milton street, where a Christmas tree was provided by their teachers and other friends. — The "Sixth Report of Lewin's Mead Meeting Domestic Mission Society," in Bristol, presents various evidence of the devotedness of their missionary, Rev. Mr. Bayley. Besides his Sunday evening Services in the chapel, and Wednesday evening Readings, he speaks of a Sunday afternoon service in private houses, where the number present on the first occasion was only three — yet he was not discouraged; of the Sunday School; the Library; the Loan Fund; the Provident Fund; the Mutual Assistance and Improvement Society; the Sick Club; and the Tracts which he had written for the benefit of those among whom he labors. — The Eighth Annual Report of Rev. Mr. Johns, minister to the poor in Liverpool, which we have been for a long time intending to notice, affords similar proof of judicious and earnest efforts for the elevation of those who are sunk in want and sin. We observe particularly that he speaks of an addition of "eight acres of land to the allotments;" and says, "There will now be 143 gardens. Every shilling of the rent has hitherto been paid, and we hope that so simple a mode of eking out the poor man's income will extend itself from year to year." — The Fifth Annual Report of the "Birmingham Unitarian Domestic Mission Society," with the address of the missionary, Rev. Mr. Bowring, has also been some time on our table. It is a particularly interesting pamphlet, and exhibits the mission in Birmingham in a state of unusual prosperity. A new chapel and school rooms have been erected, at a large expense. "The congregation occasionally numbers nearly 300;" "about sixty communicants" have in one instance partaken of the Lord's supper; the number of children in the Sunday schools is 330; day schools have also been established; and a Library and a Savings' Club are made to extend the blessings of this admirable institution.

Ordinations and Installations. — Rev. PAUL DEAN, formerly of this city, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in EASTON, Mass., December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Barrett of Boston, from Ephesians iv. 1.; the Installation Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Sanger of Dover; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Lamson of Dedham; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Huntoon of Canton; the Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Brigham of Taunton, Russell of Hingham, and Bradford of Bridgewater.

Rev. THOMAS HILL, a member of the class last graduated at the Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the Independent Congregational Church and Society in WALTHAM, Mass., December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York, from Ephesians iv. 3 — 6; the Ordaining Prayer was made by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Natick; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Fellowship of the Churches, by Rev. Mr. May of Leicester; the Address to the People by Rev. Mr. Ripley of Waltham; and the other services, by Rev. Dr. Field of Weston, Rev. Mr. Newell of Cambridge, and Rev. Mr. Frost of Concord.

Rev. THEODORE PARKER, late of Roxbury, was recognized as Minister of the "Twenty-eighth Congregational Church" in BOSTON, Mass., on Sunday, January 4, 1846. The ceremony consisted of a statement by John G. King Esq., Chairman of the Committee who had conducted the affairs of the Society, of their proceedings in securing the services of Mr. Parker, and of their belief that according to the principles of Congregationalism they were competent to settle their own minister; of the confirmation, on the part of the congregation by rising from their seats, of the proceedings of the Committee; and of Mr. Parker's verbal assent to the terms on which the connexion was formed. After which the usual morning services proceeded.

Rev. HENRY FREDERICK BOND, of Boston, a member of the last Senior class in the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Colleague Pastor, (with Rev. Dr. Thompson,) over the First Congregational Church and Society in BARRE, Mass., January 7, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Boston, from Luke xvii. 21; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Allen of Roxbury; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Thompson of Salem; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Nute of Petersham, and Greene of Brookfield.

Rev. EPHRAIM PEABODY, late of New Bedford, was inducted into office as Minister of the King's Chapel in BOSTON, Mass., on Sunday, January 11, 1846. The service was conducted by the Wardens, according to the usage of the Society in the settlement of their last three ministers; and consisted in a statement, by the Senior Warden, of the proceedings which had been adopted in relation to Mr. Peabody; the assent of the congregation to the choice which had been made of him as their minister, expressed by a unanimous Ay; the delivery of the Bible to Mr. Peabody, with some remarks, by the Warden; and prayers offered by Mr. Peabody. After which the usual morning services proceeded.

Rev. WILLIAM P. HUNTINGTON, late of Hillsboro', Ill., was installed

as Pastor of the Unitarian Church and Society in ASHBY, Mass., January 14, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston, from 1 Corinthians xv. 34; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Muzzey of Cambridge; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Babbidge of Pepperell, Chandler of Shirley, and White of Littleton.

Rev. FRANK PARKER APPLETON, of Dorchester, a recent graduate from the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Unitarian Church and Society in DANVERS, Mass., January 14, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hall of Dorchester, from Luke xviii. 8; the Prayer of Ordination was offered by Rev. Dr. Flint of Salem; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Withington of Leominster; the Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Sargent of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Thompson of Salem, Allen of Roxbury, and Bartlett of Marblehead.

Rev. JOHN H. MORISON, formerly of New Bedford, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Parish in MILTON, Mass., January 28, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston, from Matthew vii. 28; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Lunt of Quincy; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Putnam of Roxbury; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Bartol of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Angier, their late Pastor; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Huntoon of Canton, and Pike, and Hall of Dorchester.

Rev. JOHN FARWELL MOORS, who was graduated the last year at the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in DEERFIELD, Mass., January 28, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston, from 2 Corinthians v. 17–20; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield, who has for the fourth time been called to participate in the settlement of a minister over the congregation which he served in all faithfulness, till physical infirmities made him desirous of a release from professional labors; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Robinson of Medfield; the Right Hand of Fellowship by Rev. Mr. Smith of Groton; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Nute of Petersham, Brown of Brattleboro', Vt., and Nightingale of Springfield.

Rev. S. H. LLOYD, formerly of Marlboro', was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in HUBBARDSTON, Mass., February 4, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hill of Worcester, from 1 Corinthians ix. 16; the Installing Prayer was made by Rev. Mr. Lincoln of Fitchburg; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. May of Leicester; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Allen of Northboro'; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Alger of Marlboro', Greene of Brookfield, and Wellington of Templeton.

Rev. JOHN T. SARGENT, late minister of the Suffolk Street Chapel, in Boston, was installed as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in SOMERVILLE, Mass., February 18, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Furness of Philadelphia, Penn., from John xiii. 31; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Gannett of

Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Troy, N. Y.; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Clarke of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Lambert, Hodges, and Newell, of Cambridge.

Rev. ASARELAH M. BRIDGE, late of Standish, Me., was installed as Colleague Pastor (with Rev. T. F. Rogers) of the First Congregational Church and Society in BERNARDSTON, Mass., February 18, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Boston, from John x. 16; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Harding of New Salem; the Charge was given by Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Everett of Northfield; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Willis of Walpole, N. H.; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Moors of Deerfield, Barlow of Warwick, and Stearns of Rowe.

Dedications. — The First Congregational Society in EASTON, Mass., having erected a new meetinghouse, in place of the one in which their fathers had worshipped, it was dedicated to religious uses December 24, 1845. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Dean, pastor elect of the church, from Psalm cxxii. 1.; the Dedication Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Russell of Hingham; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Ballou of Stoughton, Forbes of West Bridgewater, and Bradford of Bridgewater.

The beautiful meetinghouse recently erected by the East Society in SALEM, Mass., and into which they have removed from the house which their fathers consecrated to the purposes of Christian worship nearly 130 years ago, was dedicated January 1, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Flint, the pastor of the church, from Revelation xxi. 5; the Prayer of Dedication was offered by Rev. Dr. Brazer of Salem; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Pierpont of Lynn, Thompson of Salem, and Thayer of Beverly.

The meetinghouse, intended by the First Congregational Society in ROWE, Mass. to replace their old house of worship, was dedicated January 21, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Stearns, the Pastor of the church, from Exodus xx. 24; the Dedicatory Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Everett of Northfield; an Address to the Society was made by Mr. A. B. Fuller of Cambridge; and the other services were conducted by Rev. Messrs. Bridge of Bernardston, Field of Charlemont, and Ballou of Whitingham, Vt.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Harvard College. — Our readers do not need to be informed that the vacancy created by the resignation of President Quincy has been filled. At the annual meeting of the Board of Overseers, January 22, 1846, a communication was received from the Corporation informing the Overseers, that they had made choice of Hon. Edward Everett as President; and at the adjourned meeting on the 5th of Feburary, to which time the rules of the Board required that it should lie over, the

choice of the Corporation was *unanimously* confirmed, and EDWARD EVERETT was declared by Governor Briggs, the presiding officer, to have been duly elected President of Harvard College. The whole number of votes cast was 64; and it was a most gratifying circumstance, that they were all in the affirmative. A Committee was appointed to inform Mr. Everett of his election, who at a subsequent meeting on the 19th of Feburary reported that he had signified his acceptance of the office, and his readiness to enter on its duties whenever the Corporation should desire. We know not whether Mr. Everett or the public has more occasion to rejoice in the favorable circumstances under which he will commence his Presidency. In respect to its financial and literary interests the College was never in a better position, and the discipline of the institution was never better maintained than it has been during the Presidency *pro tem.* of Dr. Walker. The Law School has found in the redoubled exertions of Professor Greenleaf all the compensation which it was possible to afford for the loss of Judge Story, while the Divinity and Medical Schools have continued to enjoy the usual measure of public favor. The whole number of Undergraduates, as given on the Catalogue published last September, is 279; of Theological Students, 32; Law Students, 145; Students attending Medical Lectures, 157; Resident Graduates, 15; Total 628.

At the meeting of the Overseers Feburary 5, other nominations made by the Corporation were acted upon. Benjamin R. Curtis Esq., of Boston, was *unanimously* chosen one of the Fellows, in the place of the late Judge Story. Hon. Stephen C. Phillips of Salem was chosen a member of the Board of Overseers, in the place of the late Mr. Saltonstall; Rev. Daniel Sharp, D. D., of Boston, in the place of Rev. Dr. Jenks, whose seat became vacant on his resignation of his ministry; and Jacob Bigelow, M. D. of Boston, to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Dr. Jackson. Each of these gentlemen was elected by a large majority, Dr. Sharp receiving 56, out of 58 votes.

At the meeting January 22, a Report was read by Judge Shaw, chairman of a Committee appointed last winter "to consider the expediency of disconnecting entirely the Theological Department from the College, and of providing that there shall be no preaching to the students in the chapel, or religious exercises other than morning and evening prayers." After a review of the history of theological education in the University, and an examination of the "gifts and grants" from which have accrued the funds for this purpose, the Report concludes that

> "Donations having been made to this body, and accepted by them, upon these trusts, for the purpose, not only of founding, but of perpetuating a department within the College for the promotion of Theological Science as a branch of University Education, the Committee are of opinion, that the College Government, and all those entrusted, for the time being, with the administration of its affairs, are under a legal, moral and conscientious obligation to retain the property so given, and faithfully to apply it to promote the objects for which it was entrusted to them; and that they have no power, in law or equity, to transfer the property, and confide these trusts to any other person or corporation."

The Committee therefore were of opinion, "that it is not expedient for the Board of Overseers to make any recommendation to the Cor-

poration, or to take any further order on the subject." A question of great importance has been put to rest by this very clear and able report. In regard to the other subject referred to them, the Committee were of opinion, "that it is not expedient to make any express recommendation to the Corporation, or to take any further order on the subject." The Report was accepted without debate, at the adjourned meeting.

The Corporation, it is understood, had made choice of Rev. George Putnam, D. D., of Roxbury, as Hollis Professor of Divinity, but he having seen fit to decline the appointment, it was not communicated to the Overseers. Dr. Putnam's removal to Cambridge, though earnestly desired by the friends of the College, was so strenuously opposed, not only by his own congregation, but by all the citizens of Roxbury, that he felt it to be his duty to remain with his people. From Judge Shaw's Report it appears, that "the income from the fund" of the Hollis Professorship, "estimated at 5 per cent., is about $200;" that is, about one-tenth part of what would be necessary for the support of a Professor. The fund given by Hollis "was small, not exceeding about $2,600; and a few small additions from other sources, of about $1,300, made it about $4,000." The Massachusetts Professorship of Natural History, which has been for some time vacant, the Dane Professorship of Law, held by the late Judge Story, and the Rumford Professorship, which Professor Treadwell has resigned on account of ill health, remain to be filled by the Corporation.

Rather less than a year ago we spoke of the College as "passing through a trial," such, however, as it had often encountered before. We congratulate its friends that it has passed through this trial with an increased security against future assaults upon the liberal principles on which it has long been conducted. The attempt to introduce a change has met with a defeat, which we regard with the more satisfaction, because it has been brought about by the clear expression of public sentiment, in rebuke of those who, whether for political or religious ends, would have removed the institution from the control of its present guardians.

Errata. — In the haste of revising the final sheets of our last number, we overlooked two errors, each of which, if we should allow it to stand uncorrected, might justly subject us to the imputation of wishing to mislead our readers. The signature to the first notice on page 147 should be E. And in our "Notice" on page 160, we should have said, that the enlargement of our journal would make an addition of *thirty-six* pages to each volume. We did not perceive our mistake of including six numbers in a volume till after the page was printed. An error also occurred on page 138, where the 5th line from the bottom should have been — Note to Article III. In an earlier page, also, of the number, p. 27, the last line, "fourscore" should be *forty*.

*** Our readers will not find fault with our again adding four pages to the regular size of our number.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

MAY, 1846.

Art. I.—COQUEREL'S SERMONS.*

M. Athanase Coquerel has been known for many years as one of the most eloquent preachers in Paris. He belongs to the body of the Pastors of the Reformed Church, by whose arrangements, if we rightly understand them, the different preachers preach successively in the different churches, so that each in turn addresses every Reformed congregation in the city. M. Coquerel graduated at Montauban in 1816; in 1818 he assumed the pastoral charge of the Reformed church in Amsterdam, and in 1830 was called to Paris.†

Those of his sermons which have been printed, have been published, separately or in collections, at different periods since 1818. Within four or five years past, M. Coquerel has found himself engaged in a controversy of pamphlets with different theologians and laymen in France, which has added some other essays to those which were written for

* *Sermons.* Par Athanase Coquerel, l'un des Pasteurs de l' Eglise R formée de Paris. Quatre Recueils. Amsterdam and Paris. 1818—1843. 3 Vols. 8vo. pp. 564, 478, 480.

† See Christ. Exam. for Nov. 1844. IVth Ser. Vol. II. pp. 303, 304.

the pulpit. He has also published some elementary, and other theological Essays, besides a larger volume of great merit — "Biographée Sacrée." The controversy of which we speak, sprang up in consequence of an effort to set off M. Coquerel and other preachers from the body of the Reformed clergy endowed by the State, on the ground that they did not hold to the doctrines of the Reformed Church. It was perfectly true, that in his views, and we suppose, those of other preachers accused like him, of whom there were four or five in Paris, there is a constant protest against the use of religious formulas, or the imposition of the restraint of creeds upon the conscience of the believer. The whole tone of his preaching is warmly and enthusiastically evangelical, and at the same time, and for that reason, warmly and enthusiastically liberal and benevolent. There is no question that he himself, and we suppose the gentlemen who were accused with him, had no faith in some of the best beloved dogmas of Calvin, and that the theology which he enforced in the pulpit, and the practical lessons he drew from it, were such as never could have been uttered by a Calvinistic preacher. The efforts made by a Calvinistic association to oust him and his friends from their position were systematic, though at first somewhat stealthy. They did not fail to defend themselves, and the rights of liberal inquiry, before the public and the Government. The pamphlets prepared by M. Coquerel and his friends were written with great eloquence, — some of them involving the mere question of the rights of free preaching and free religion, while others discussed boldly and clearly, to our minds very satisfactorily, the theological opinions which were at issue. These pamphlets are an earnest and very convincing statement of the spirit, the power, and the necessity of Christianity without cant or creed, — the definition, if we understand it, of what is called Unitarianism in America, of what M. Coquerel, in some of his sermons and pamphlets, calls "Modern Orthodoxy." The friends of Christian freedom triumphed in the issue which we have described, and the Government endowments are now distributed just as they were. The only effect, so far as we know, produced by the discussion, has been to divert to the theological questions at issue more general attention, and to enlarge the audiences of the Unitarian preachers.

We speak with pleasure of the Sermons before us, which are scarcely ever of a controversial bearing or tone. They exhibit M. Coquerel's earnest enthusiasm and fervor in the more congenial labors of arousing Christian life, and tracing practical lessons from the Scriptures. We think them a remarkable collection. The style, of course, varies somewhat between the earlier and later sermons; and the latest bear most decided marks of maturity, — they are less ornate, less French perhaps we might say, than the earliest. All of them are marked strongly with the attention to rhetorical effect, which is characteristic of the French pulpit. But there is not one of them, where true fervor and devotion do not show themselves beneath and behind all graces of language and style. M. Coquerel's faith is of the warmest and most hopeful kind. He looks firmly, steadily at sin or temptation, and demonstrates calmly and clearly that they must give way before Christian faith. His philosophy and his ethics and his statesmanship show everywhere this foundation on which they rest. An eager student of the Old Testament, with almost a poet's power to revivify its narratives and bring before our eyes the movements of its heroes, he is still so imbued with his simply Christian enthusiasm, that he does not deceive himself for a moment into an exaggerated statement of Jewish faith, Jewish philosophy, or Jewish morals. The connection between the two "Alliances," the Old and the New, is a matter clear to his understanding; and he constantly recurs to it, with a distinctness of ideas which does credit to his good sense as a theologian and his Christian confidence and fervor.

"No manner of studying the sacred Scriptures," says he, "is more instructive perhaps, or more useful, than those wide and long comparisons, where we contrast the two Covenants in their books, doctrines, and rites, and even in the character of the divine messengers to whom the world owes them, or of the just who have obeyed, or of the bad who have violated them. Thus we study the two revelations at once; we can distinguish without separating them, — can bring them together without confounding them; each lends and borrows light, so to speak, and is the clearer for it. * * * * * Each of them has the splendor which it should have, each its own character, spirit, beauty, and sacredness. Such profound differences were at once necessary and desirable. The periods were different; — look at the sacred annals, and see if the age of Abraham, or that of

Moses or David or Ezra, resembles that of Jesus. The designs were different; — the old Covenant, which was to endure only through a certain time and to fill a certain place, was fitted only for the climate of Judea, her state of manners, of liberty, and civilization; it is the porch, the vestibule, and not the building; it is the court-yard, but not the sanctuary. In a word, the old Covenant was addressed only to Jews, was made only for them and the few proselytes whom it almost regretted to receive; the Gospel addresses itself to all men, its empire is the world, and it is so framed as to adapt itself wherever the sun shines, or men breathe the air.

"A single objection to such comparison deserves a word of answer. 'Who are we,' it may be asked, 'that we should thus weigh in a balance the Old and New Testament, to pronounce upon their merits, to compare their virtues, to decide which is the more sacred, the more efficacious, the more consolatory, and to give the preference to the Gospel over the Law.' Who are we, my brethren? I will tell you. We are Christians; — and precisely because the Gospel is the complement and development of the old Covenant, it should be its superior." — Quatrième Recueil. pp. 356 – 360.

The enthusiastic fervor of sentiment of which we speak gives life to discussions on a wide variety of topics. There is scarcely an ethical subject, even among what we choose to call the minor morals, to which he does not allude, always with a nice dissection of appearances, and a distinct exposition of the principle which is to be applied to them.

Such we conceive to be the prominent characteristics of the sermons. Their theology indeed is careful and well-sustained, but their fervor and clearness give to them the interest by which they attract the favor they receive. They are impassioned in language, but there is very little exaggeration. Warm rhetorical appeals are addressed, not to imaginary creatures, but to the men and women of Amsterdam or Paris, who are listening to the preacher. Descriptions of the death of Jonathan, the crimes of Ahab, the mourning for Abijah, decorated with whatever accuracy of ornament or pathos, speak to the listener of the nineteenth century with lessons for his own life and his own time. The singular variety of subjects adds to this vividness an effect, which must in almost all instances have absolutely commanded the attention of the hearer. This variety, ranging over every class of subjects of theology or of practical life, is much greater than the variety of treatment. The

sermons, when read as a series, become monotonous; their French vivacity at times palls upon us, and the last read is by no means so effective as the first. This difficulty results naturally from using them in a connection different from that for which they were intended.

We had prepared ourselves to go into some little discussion of the peculiarities of French preaching, but our readers would hardly thank us for it. Its faults are not so prominent in these sermons as in most French sermons; and we suppose that the Protestant pulpit is everywhere improving, by an abandonment of merely national habits. There is something of the rigidity of division, the oratorical formality, and the quaintness of expression, which have often given us a distaste to French pulpit oratory. Occasionally a long prayer is introduced into the discourse. But these peculiarities are scarcely so strongly marked as to attract attention. Were they much more striking, the sermons would still be earnest, devout, inspiriting statements and illustrations of religious truth, well rewarding careful study, and well worthy a place in the closet library of serious Christians.

M. Coquerel's mind has been trained, it would seem, under the tendencies of the present French system of liberal education. The French colleges appear to devote some attention to every branch of study which has attracted the notice of modern inquirers. There are not so many classical students in France now, as there were seventy years ago, — and the reason for this probably is, that there is so much attention paid to modern languages and modern sciences. Such mental training gives to a preacher in M. Coquerel's position some decided advantages. He is perfectly at home in his allusions to the physical science of the present day; and in his frequent comments on the insufficiency of mere intellectual philosophy to cheer the life or save the soul of man, you feel that he is not speaking at random, without a personal knowledge of its efforts and its tendencies. Such general information is the more needed, because, as the whole tenor of the discourses shows, even when they are on subjects which differ widely from each other, the preacher turns with most earnestness and most frequently to combat the scientific irreligion of France. He evidently fears infidelity more than bigotry or superstition.

He has left controversy with Calvinists and Romanists to his controversial pamphlets; while, like Solomon, he combats "those who are able to know so much as to aim at the world,"—constantly asking them, "why they do not sooner find out the Lord thereof?" Such questioning, such contests, make but a sorry display of Christian strength, when they come from men who do not thoroughly know with what they are contending. Nothing is more mournful, than to hear in a Christian sermon or Christian argument an allusion of any kind to what is called profane science, which the speaker himself does not comprehend. A mere figure of speech, which betrays any ignorance of the field of learning from which it is drawn, would always be much better avoided than ventured; for the slightest shadow over its accuracy suggests that it owes its position only to a wish for brilliancy. So far as we have seen, M. Coquerel is able to allude to physical science without paining his hearers with impossible astronomy or monstrous chemistry; certainly he speaks of intellectual systems with the clearness of a man who has tested them and knows their strength. He does not crush geology, to uphold the book of Genesis; for he knows what geology is. He does not fly in the face of political economy without knowing what political economy is. And when he dissects a metaphysical or logical system, he shows, in the clearness of his own views and arguments, that he knows how far to use mental and dialectic training.

The power gained from such wide and general information gives a peculiar raciness and freshness to the tone of these writings. Eminently evangelical, as we have said, and exhibiting to the full that careful study of revelation, which seeks from its earliest and most obscure voices the training by which it shall be prepared to interpret the later and the most clear, M. Coquerel's eloquence is still the eloquence of the nineteenth century. This man, at least, says the hearer, is not giving to us what the world has outgrown.

Such a man has a right to draw such contrasts as are presented in this passage.

"But misery, alas, is often misconduct, and more often improvidence. * * * This remark, which is confirmed by so wide experience of these two most frequent aspects of misery, is

the proof, that humanity will never be able to give what they need to all the members of the great family, until it works with the hands of Christian charity. For such effort all other social forces are insufficient.

"The hand of human justice is too heavy to soothe such sensitive wounds, — she only thinks of public disorders. What we need is a care of private disorders, and when justice attempts to give to poverty what it needs, she changes its name and calls it mendicity.

"And statesmanship, civil government, has too much to do in taking care of the masses to be able to look at families or individuals. The tie which binds the citizen to the government naturally enough excites more interest in its counsels, than the tie of associated brotherhood.

"Philosophy lives too much in the sphere of abstractions, to attack successfully so many realities all heaped together; it is too much occupied with the general system of the world as it should be, to take up and care for the details of society as it is.

"Civilization knows how to disguise the evil, and keep it at a distance, but is not so skilful in curing it. Civilization begins by marking the wide distinctions between the refinements of superfluity and the simplicities of necessity, and carries this process so far that she will never consent to condemn them.

"And lastly, the youngest of sciences, this political economy, which has failed so utterly to fulfil the seductive promises of its first labors, has not yet decided on the secret of the production of public wealth. How can it teach us then the means of enriching the poor?

"Do not doubt it, my brethren, it is for charity, for this, the most excellent of all virtues, — which the world owes to Jesus, and of which Jesus first gave the perfect rule and true model, — it is for Christian charity that God reserves this glory and this joy. Charity only will have the necessary power, the necessary patience, the necessary compassion; charity only will never stop till she has gained the mark; charity only will put an end to misery, and her voice alone will say to the rich, 'Enjoy your abundance, but in giving us the crumbs which fall from your table, see that there are crumbs enough;' and to the poor, in multiplying for them these crumbs like the five loaves in the desert, her voice will say, 'Here is the supply for your necessities.'" — Quatrième Recueil. pp. 400 – 404.

The precision of detail gives their force to such passages as the following.

"As the naturalist, who sees everywhere around him the traces of a great physical convulsion, so I, when I see around me everywhere the results of a great moral change, wish to trace

them back to the day and place which saw their birth. Where is the man, who in sight of the whole brilliancy of day, and the glory of the sun illuminating his immense empire, would not wish to see the uncertain dawn which precedes such splendor, and the luminary which causes it at the moment when it mounts into the skies?

"I know that this highly civilized continent, which has made the rest of the world tributary to its power and its arts, once saw its nations seeking their gods in temples where they were thought to live, or beneath the dark vaults of forests, or in the clouds which floated over their heads. Christianity is now established in those very same places. In those very same places the name of Jesus is adored. True, I see divisions and errors, but from day to day these pass away, and the very importance which is attached to such discussions is a testimony of the importance of the Gospel which they discuss. I see each nation reading this Gospel in its own language, and this divine book spread everywhere among the poor of all people. I travel back, upon the course of events. I pass in review the series of the ages. I call upon the past to explain to me the position of the present. On my way, there are some prominent points where I pause. I admire the noble labors of those courageous Reformers who restored its original purity to Christianity. Beyond their time, I scarcely recognise Christianity, so disfigured is it by strange innovations; human ideas are mingled closely with divine institutions, and I meet man everywhere where I should have found God alone. I respect the ill-fated zeal of those who before our time have protested against such deplorable combination. I traverse terror-struck those ages of darkness, where ignorance associates with barbarism, where superstition and fanaticism assume the name, the power and the rights of religion. But after I pass this long night, the horizon is gradually enlightened; I see the last altars of Paganism falling, I see the sceptre of the Empire prostrate before the cross of the Gospel; I review those terrible persecutions which could not shake the constancy of the Christians; I hear one of their most eloquent defenders say to their enemies, 'We are of yesterday, and already we fill the town, the country, the camp, the Senate, and the palace; we leave you nothing but your temples.' In search of the place which saw the beginning of a worship that has been so rapid in its triumphs, I go farther back towards the epoch of its origin. My course leads me to ancient Judea. Even then I find these Christians everywhere as I go. But I do not recognise the kingdom or the people of the Davids and the Solomons, I see no longer the pomp of the worship of Moses, the glory of the Eternal has no visible resting-place in this condemned nation. I ask for the magnificent temple, which even

Heathen travellers thought a wonder of the world, and men direct me to its smoking ruins; the name of Jehovah is not repeated above the pile; I am told that a prophecy has been fulfilled, that the second temple has mingled its ruins with the ruins of the first. I find Christians where I looked for Jews. I seek for the ministers who have taught this conquering faith;—they are tax-gatherers, fishermen and tent-makers. I seek the Master who taught them;—they bid me ascend Calvary, and show to me a cross. I wish at least to visit the place of his birth, to imagine myself present in the first hours of his life, to enrol the number of his first adorers;—I am led to Bethlehem. I seek him who is acknowledged the Son of God and the Saviour of the world, I seek the first worshippers of him before whom angels worship, the first resting-place of him whose empire is the universe, the point from which the Gospel starts which is to extend to the ends of the world;—I am led to Bethlehem,—I find an infant in a manger and a few shepherds clustered around him."—1er. et 2e Recueils. pp. 69–71.

The elaborate accuracy of painting which distinguishes many descriptive passages in these Sermons, and leads to the multiplication of such passages, is not to be spoken of simply as a luxury of style. It seems to result rather from the intense fervency of the writer's disposition, stimulating him to look at every detail in the light of the principle which he is illustrating, and making clear to him trifles which a cooler head would have neglected. An enthusiastic botanist describes not only the lofty tree, but the parasites and epiphytes and lichens which are upon it. It is not mere accuracy of mind which suggests such precision of description, but his intense interest in the living principle which animates each plant. The keen-sighted observation which springs from such fervency ought not be ridiculed or slighted as petty; although it should often descend into a minuteness of detail, which needs the full force of such justification to excuse it.

There is a nicety in the practical application to daily life of moral principles, illustrated in these discourses, which constantly evinces the action of this earnest fervency. The same confidence animates the preacher in his views of social, fashionable, or family institutions and habits around him, as in his view of physical science or of philosophy. And hence there is a vividness and reality in the purely moral exhortations of the discourses, which must have given to them a remarkable force when delivered from the

pulpit. The whole series abounds in brilliant pictures. Every social change described or contemplated, every historical incident mentioned or illustrated, is acted out before the eye of the reader. A brilliant imagination, and the fervency of which we speak, give to these pictures their startling reality, much more often than the detail which we have been excusing, which is occasionally wearisome. In his references to history, which are frequent and careful, these traits supply the deficiencies which he justly ascribes to written history.

"History cannot tell us of particular and private fortunes. These are lost in her wide survey; she has no concern with domestic happiness. The victory which is described on a single page, and excites our admiration to-day, cost, in its time, the tears of thousands of families; and the descendants of conquerors, in remembering their trophies, forget the distresses and mourning which they occasioned. History leads us through palaces, temples, senates and councils, — we can see the whole of public life; but she cannot open to us the interior of the more humble houses where mediocrity lives, nor the workshops of industry, nor the cottages of agriculture, nor the asylums of poverty. We should knock there, if we would know whether another age was more unhappy or more prosperous than our own." — 1er et 2e Recueils. p. 270, 271

A lively imagination, assisted by a clear appreciation of the force of spiritual influences, fills up such blanks in history. Take as an instance the passage in the Sermon on the dangers of large cities, where from allusions to life in Amsterdam he makes out his picture of life in Jerusalem, — a transfer which is too well maintained to suggest or provoke a smile.

"True, ages pass away, prejudices die out, manners change, cities perish, nations disappear or are dispersed over the earth, and new cities are built up in turn. But that which neither perishes nor changes, which remains the same in every climate and age, is the human heart. It matters little under what excuse we sin. It matters little why we waste our time. It matters little which vanity is preferred by the conceit of the moment. There is still sin, neglect, or conceit; and, at the bottom of his heart, a Pharisee was puffed up in exactly the same way as we are. Let us not deceive ourselves: — our ears indeed will never hear the sudden, piercing shouts of 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' we shall never see Jesus coming to us as Jerusalem saw him one day, — and only one day; and yet

there are around us the same causes which bade them ask, 'Who is this?' We in our way may be misconceiving Christ, as did the Jews in theirs. Do you think that in the crowd which ran before him there were none who said to themselves at the moment when he did wrong, 'No one will see this?' Do you think there was no cunning worldling, who took advantage of the tumult of a great town to appear pure in public while he was a sensualist at home? Do you think that in that crowd there was no man of leisure, who scattered his ennui from house to house, thought himself of great use and very busy when he sat with the Sanhedrim or at the disputes of the Scribes, and threw away upon nothings the time which God had given him that he might study His oracles, and find out who this Jesus was? Do you think that in this crowd there was no Jew, proud that he lived in Jerusalem, proud of worshipping God in this magnificent temple, and not in a provincial synagogue, and who, as his only reason for not believing in Jesus, constantly said, 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' What! in this solemn moment, when Jesus comes to take possession of the temple, when his reign begins, these Jews of Jerusalem do not recognise him! What then have they been doing while the Christ has filled Judea with his teachings, his benefits and his miracles, while all Jerusalem has been ringing with the tale of the resurrection of Lazarus? I answer from a judgment of the human heart. Some were doing wrong in secret,—some were doing nothing,—others were glorifying themselves; and the Christ comes, and they do not adore him. They say to each other, 'Who is this?' And this phrase prepares them to cry a few days after, 'Crucify him! crucify him!'"

"And we, my brethren, who worship in a temple which is dear to us, we who are attached by so many noble recollections to the city of our home, we who live in the Jerusalem of our country, if it were possible that some day Jesus should suddenly enter our walls,—how should we be occupied? Should we be ready to receive him? Should we be sure to recognise him? 'Recognise him!' you will say to me,—'and who of us has not the knowledge of Christ? From our infancy, his name has sounded on our ears, we have grown old repeating it, and we shall not now forget it.' Brethren, it is true that the name of Jesus is now heard everywhere and read everywhere; but is he always in our hearts as he should be? See to that! For men often think they know Jesus, when they only know his name; they think they remember him, when unconsciously they have forgotten him. Lost in the crowd of this vast city, if we are faithful here and faithless there, is that to know the Lord? No; it is to forget that he is everywhere.

Occupied every day with the frivolities of the world, if we lose in doing nothing the time which is left to us before death, is that to know the Lord? No; it is to forget that he demands from us an account of every moment of life. Proud in the perishable advantages which surround us, if vanity under any pretext enter our hearts, is that to know the Lord? No; it is to forget that he resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble." —1er et 2e Recueils. pp. 185 – 187.

We cannot close this notice of a collection which has given us great pleasure, without expressing the wish that more general attention were paid to the sermons and other practical results of Continental theological study. We believe that some of these discourses have been put to a very proper use, and published more widely than others, in translations delivered from the pulpit. But they might be read and studied more generally than by the clergy. Every other child is taught now to read French, and yet the language when attained is only half used, if used at all. Why is it, that the Christian Church of New England, or of America, should be so ignorant as it is, of the hopes and fears, the thoughts and struggles and exhortations, of people and pastors of the hundreds of thousands of European churches, where also are anxious hearts and living souls? Everything is to be gained from a comparison of national tastes and habits of thought. The mere change of language is no trifle. An illustration might be drawn from the coldness with which habit makes us receive such tremendous words as those which express the very foundation-principles of our religion, as repentance, reformation, sanctification, communion, salvation. That coldness vanishes in the study of the Bible, or its comments, in a less familiar language. The term, for instance, of which our translations above have reminded us, with which the French preacher speaks of the new Covenant, has a warmer tone than ours. "La Nouvelle Alliance" does not suggest a bargain or a contract; it bears to the English ear, not yet habituated to the sound, the remembrance of the bond which unites the children to their Father; it speaks of the family union which the first heir has revealed to us, on the comprehension of which he built the church of his united brethren.

E. E. H.

Art. II. — VESTIGES OF CREATION AND SEQUEL.*

"Of natural philosophy," says Bacon, "the basis is natural history; the stage next the basis is physic; the stage next the vertical point is metaphysic. To those who refer all things to the glory of God, they are as the three acclamations, 'sancte, sancte, sancte:' holy in description of his works; holy in the connexion; and holy in the union of them in a *perpetual and uniform law*." This is one of those noble expressions, by which the higher order of scientific minds have sought to give dignity to their field of labor, and to show its connexion with the infinite domain of truth.

Keeping this thought in view, we have taken up the volume, whose title has already become familiar to every reader. The appearance of a "Sequel," in which its statements are deliberately repeated and justified, gives us an opportunity to take our part in the discussion, which now, for a year or more, has been carried on by the most elaborate articles from the ablest pens. We do not, of course, pretend to enter the lists with men of high and acknowledged authority in the various branches of science; but some reflections, bearing upon the general topic under consideration, may not be inappropriate at the present stage of the debate.

The importance of the "Vestiges," as we regard it, consists not in its literary execution or its scientific depth, both of which have been singularly overrated on the one hand, and disparaged on the other. Neither is it in the singular and startling character which the author's hypothesis bears to many minds. To us this theory of "the development of life on our planet" is no new and strange suggestion; but one which we had encountered before we had seen this book, in discussion with intelligent men of ordinary scientific acquirements, and which, in some of its details, had

* 1. *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.* Second Edition, from the third London edition greatly amended by the Author, and an Introduction by Rev. G. B. Cheever D. D. New York. Wiley & Putnam. 1845. 12mo. pp. 280.

2. *Explanations; a Sequel to "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation."* By the Author of that Work. New York. Wiley & Putnam. 1846. 12mo. pp. 142.

become familiarized to our mind. But the value of the book in question is, that it is a clear and connected statement of a very common tendency of thought. In the main, it is concise, attractive and well-sustained; in some parts, forcible, striking and even eloquent. The theory we do not consider to be as new as the author himself regards it. For its elaborate statement and defence, and for the prominence with which the points of discussion now stand out before the public mind, we are indebted to him. Every statement he has made may be denied, and each argument he has used may be successively confuted; but the tendency he represents will still remain. An excessive generalizing of the scope and agency of natural law, till it seems to absorb and blot out every other power in the universe, will be a prevailing habit of many minds; and some, in spite of every confutation and denial, will welcome and apply the conclusions of this very book. And say what we will, the researches of modern science afford much apparent justification to such a tendency. Now how shall this state of things be met? Allowing every argument, conceding the plausibility of the author's whole scheme, how are the great topics of life and duty affected by it? This is the question which we shall keep steadily in sight, and answer as clearly as we can.

The author's position and purpose we shall first state, as nearly as we can, in his own words. The special hypotheses, (such as the nebulous origin of the globe, and "organic creation in the manner of natural law,") are subordinate to the main object of the work. This is, to show that "the whole revelation of the works of God is based in LAW; by which, however, is not meant a system independent or exclusive of Deity, but one which only proposes *a certain mode of his working*." This "has long been pointed to by science, though hardly anywhere broadly and fully contemplated."

"The time seems to have come," he says, "when it is proper to enter into a re-examination of the whole subject, in order to ascertain whether in what we actually know, there is most evidence in favor of an entire or a partial system of fixed order. When led to make this inquiry for myself, I soon became convinced that the idea of any exception to the plan of law stood upon a narrow and constantly narrowing foundation, depending,

indeed, on a few difficulties or obscurities, rather than objections, which were certain soon to be swept away by the advancing tide of knowledge. It appeared, at the same time, that there was a want in the state of philosophy amongst us, of an impulse in the direction of the consideration of this theory, so as to bring its difficulties the sooner to a bearing in the one way or the other; and hence it was that I presumed to enter the field." — *Sequel*, pp. 2, 3.

When we consider that the theory he maintains has been the object, on the one hand, of the most indiscriminate admiration and defence, and, on the other, of equally indiscriminate censure, ridicule and even abuse, the difficulty of making a fair statement of it is very apparent. It adds to the difficulty, that while the one part have sustained and further carried out unimportant inferences and hints, which make the moral bearing of the book apparently doubtful and even repulsive, the other part have most needlessly sought to obscure or deny very harmless positions, which, but for this controversy, no one would ever have thought of disputing.

To proceed to the author's theory. It begins with that magnificent cosmogony, which blends together the last results of almost the whole circle of the sciences. Setting out with the nebulous hypothesis of Herschel and Laplace, he brings us to the time when the earth was a great whirling globe of molten fire. Then he traces down the series of geological phenomena by which its surface was brought to its present form. The slow hardening of the first rugged crust, heaved and shaken by the fiery waves beneath; the dusky, sultry cloud of vapors, gradually settling into clearness, while with raging storms torrents of water poured down into the depths from the cliff-sides, carrying with them great beds of the torn and crumbling mass; the vast simmering sea, resting on a hot, unstable bottom, and for long ages *boiling down* the river-deposits into solid "primary strata;" the terrific convulsions with which, at distant intervals, these were upheaved by earthquakes, — compared to which those of the present day are but the slight returning shudder after a strong man's convulsions — earthquakes submerging whole continents and changing sea into land; the swelling and rending and swaying to and fro of those solid fetters, by which the vast deep was at length securely chained; then the clustering mosses and

numberless varieties of shells, marking the introduction of life upon the new-formed earth; the enormous forests of palm and gigantic fern, which were one after another sunk and folded together like a leaf into thick coal-beds, by the terrific forces of the great deep; the shoals of fishes; the swarms of gigantic reptiles; the strange and uncouth forms of "beasts and creeping things innumerable;" the gradual advance made, as the continents became settled and the air more clear, towards higher forms of animated being; and the preparation thus going on, through countless centuries, for the future habitation of the lord of all this wondrous creation; — these furnish the outline of that "biography of the earth." They are detailed, though not with any beauty or force of imagination, yet with a clearness and method which make them attractive, even through their driest scientific details, in the opening chapters of the work.

We have thus traced rapidly, keeping as near as possible to the author's leading idea, the general course of those marvellous changes, through which that great cloud of "fire-mist," or that ball of surging flame, had to pass. We are led on, step by step, through the gradations of being that successively appear, till we come down to the present appearance of the earth. Here we find the clear air, the drifting cloud, the pouring river, the diversities of climate; the countless multitude of living things, — life swarming in every nook, and oozing out at every pore; the various species of plants or animals, themselves countlessly diversified, and each exquisitely adapted to the spot it must inhabit; the many elements, single or in numberless combinations, nicely adjusted, and distributed with amazing forethought and accurate proportion; those subtle agents, electricity and light, half matter half spirit, darting with the speed of thought from place to place, the hands and eyes, as it were, of Omnipotence itself; *life* everywhere, harmonized, balanced, restrained and provided for; — such is the grand, crowning display, for which all the rest was but a course of preparation, ordained of eternity, in the counsels of the Most High.

It would be injustice here not to quote the author's words.

"And what a preconception or forethought have we here! For let us only for a moment consider how various are the exter-

nal physical conditions in which animals live — climate, soil, temperature, land, water, air: the peculiarities of food, and the various ways in which it is to be sought: the peculiar circumstances in which the business of reproduction and the care-taking of the young are to be attended to: all these requiring to be taken into account, and thousands of animals to be formed, suitable in organization and mental character for the concerns they were to have with these various conditions and circumstances, — here a tooth fitted for crushing nuts; there a claw fitted to serve as a hook for suspension; here to repress teeth and develope a bony net-work instead; there to arrange for a bronchial apparatus, to last only for a certain brief time: let us, I say, only consider these things, and we shall see that the decreeing of laws to bring the whole about was an act involving such a degree of wisdom and device as we only can attribute, adoringly, to the one Eternal and Unchangeable. It may be asked, how does this reflection comport with that timid philosophy which would have us to draw back from the investigation of God's works, lest the knowledge of them should make us undervalue his greatness, and forget his paternal character?" — *Vestiges*, p. 178.

Such is a slender outline of the scheme of creation displayed in the earth on which we dwell. It is to the hidden plan of this, that science seeks to find a clue. It is through the mazes of this, that the author of the work before us studies to find the foot-prints of the mysterious power that framed it; the "vestiges of the *natural history of creation*." What order does all this follow? Are all the parts mutually connected and dependent? Do all result from the same fiat of the Almighty will? Have the method and rule of succession been appointed from the beginning; and is what we see, in its overwhelming complexity, but the development of one unchanging plan? Consider that "the great globe itself and all that it inhabit," make but a single unnoticed speck in a vast "sand-cloud" of myriads of firmaments — each perhaps as glorious and varied as that which sparkles in its immensity above us in the winter sky. Have we any hint, can we find any trace of order, that shall justify us in saying that the whole flood of life, the whole solemn march of evolution, is but the uniform, unbroken progression of one thought of God? Such, we conceive, is the question which the author of this volume, in no irreverent spirit, has attempted to solve. Such is the intricate obscurity in which he has undertaken to trace

the steady lines of a certain order, and an all-enfolding plan. The immensity and overpowering vastness of the whole *problem of the universe* must be kept in view, if we would do justice to the man, or understand the nature of the task he has set himself about.

Let us fairly see and meet the difficulty which he attempts to solve. On the one hand, the minutely perfect adaptation of each thing to its sphere, the numberless marks of benevolent forethought everywhere shown, the wonderful balance maintained among so many conflicting elements, and the steady advance everywhere manifest towards higher and higher forms of being, compel us to acknowledge the wisdom and love that rule in all, and to lift our thoughts towards an intelligent Creator. On the other hand, every mind experiences a difficulty, which cannot be got over, in referring each single thing to the immediate and, so to speak, mechanical agency of the Infinite. This speculative difficulty indicates the position, from which the main argument of the work proceeds. To use the words of Cudworth, "In the judgment of the writer it is not so decorous in respect of God neither, that he should set his own hand, as it were, to every work, and immediately do all the meanest and triflingest things himself drudgingly; * * * from whence it would follow also, that they are all done either forcibly and violently, or else artificially only, and none of them by any inward principle of their own." *

We state the difficulty in the words of Cudworth, rather than of this writer, both as being less invidious, and as showing that it has always pressed upon a certain class of minds. For ourselves, we do not like the statement. We know that it can be instantly met by the question, — how does anything, too trivial or too painful to be regarded as an immediate creation, change its character, when provided for, ages beforehand, in an undeviating counsel? How is a disease or a monster accounted for, (suppose our mind startled and pained by it,) by throwing its creation back indefinitely, or by referring it, as Cudworth does, to an inferior "plastic nature?" And so the difficulty still remains.

---

* Intellectual System. Ch. III. § 37. 4.

To all this there is, and so far as we know can be, but one reply. There are *laws of nature*, unchanging and universal. There are modes of operation, perfectly uniform and steady, in conformity with which most of the results we see are brought about, and to which they can be directly traced. We know that the reply is only verbal. We know that the name, *law*, is nothing but a name. We know that it is impossible for the human mind to go behind that name, and metaphysically account for the physical fact. Still the name means much to us. Some may say, what after all is a "law," but a mode of the Divine action? What power but that of God does in fact operate? To this we answer, none other; but our satisfaction is, not in finding a different source of the power, but in knowing that the mode of its action is perfectly regular, and *can be ascertained by us*. This, we conceive, is the real value of the name, and of natural science which interprets it. And thus understood, the phrase "laws of nature" has a meaning to us, very far from being either barren or irreverent.

Minds of every degree of cultivation, and all minds in proportion to their scientific clearness, see and acknowledge the real significance and value of natural laws. The substance of what we say, no one could think of disputing or disparaging. No one doubts that the apparent evil, as well as good, in nature is produced and defined by its own appointed laws. No one can doubt or deny that these laws go on to accomplish themselves, so to speak, with unerring, we might say appalling, certainty. Fever, pestilence, distortion, idiocy, are facts, terrible but undeniable. Who shall refuse to hear of their being traced to laws? And who will fail to be relieved from painful doubt, to know that these very laws are every instant working out an enormous amount of good, in their own sphere, compared with which the seeming evil becomes infinitesimal, and disappears? And is not this a different sort of relief, from the conviction that God with his own hand thus unsparingly metes out, with such fearful accuracy, the exact measure of anguish and horror? The phrase, then, "laws of nature," far from being meaningless, meets very exactly a most pressing want, both of the intellect and of the heart.

One other illustration shall bring us back to the train of our author's argument. A man has no hesitation in casting

the seed—say, of a fruit-tree — into the earth, and intrusting it to the operation of "natural causes." He knows that sunshine and drought and wet, heat or cold, rain, insect or mildew, soil, care, and grafting, will all have their exact measure of effect upon it; each according to some known or discoverable law. He also knows that its various products, tissue, fibre, pore, leaf, bark, root, wood, flower, fruit, together with all the inconceivably minute and infinitely varied particles of which these are composed, are all evolved mysteriously out of the living germ contained within the seed; and that each single element is selected, with unfailing accuracy, from the earth, air or water that may be about the seed, and is conveyed, without any deviation, to its appointed place. Such is an outline of the vital process, carried on by the laws of nature, in the growth of every tree.

Now here, in the broad field of the universe, is this seedling of our earth, — a speck in the vast firmament of suns and worlds. Science traces its growth, through many stages, up to its present condition. We may regard it as a *vital process*, if we will, analogous to the growth of the tree. And its countless products, comprehending the races of plants and animals, with their growth and reproduction, habits, instincts, fitnesses and wants, may be the evolution of the one law of the world's growth. Nay, even including man, with his complex powers and diversified scene of action, with all his strange, eventful history, with his passion and ambition, with all the changes and modifications of his social life, with his polity and laws, his literature and art, with his crimes and virtues, with his heroism or sordidness, devotion, love or hate; all may be — why not — but the more complicated and marvellous unfolding of that mysterious germ cast here millions of ages ago. Such is the vast, sweeping and overwhelming thought which the writer attempts to grasp, and to present in his theory of creation.

He does not profess to compass the whole subject, or to answer every difficulty. His statements, he says, are "merely thrown out as hints towards the formation of a just hypothesis." He does not disguise what he conceives to be the logical results of his postulate, that *all things* are included and governed by fixed, unalterable, unerring law.

Life, up to its highest forms, including even man, is but the transmission and development of the germ originally quickened into vitality. The subtle power of electricity can, any day, renew the first step of that process, and bring living things, a germ or a full-formed animal, out of inorganic matter. Wherever a spot of volcanic rock or a fragment of coral peers above the sea, it is instantly occupied with "spontaneous" forms of living growth, and the process of development towards higher forms is already begun. Distinctions of genera and species, commonly thought to be original and fundamental, are by him merged and obliterated in his scheme of organic evolution. There has been a steady upward growth from the humblest to the highest; and man himself is but the comparative perfection of that type, which has been struggling, as it were, for clearer expression, through every successive grade of animated being. The facts of physiology are ransacked for obscure hints to bear out the separate portions of this hypothesis. The statistics of crime are appealed to, as showing that even the operations of the human will, on a broad scale, are bound by unalterable law, and can be reduced to scientific calculation. In his view "man is a piece of mechanism;" * "part of a series of phenomena;" and free will is "nothing more than a vicissitude in the supremacy of the faculties over each other."† "Mental action passes at once into the category of natural things. Its old metaphysical character vanishes in a moment, and the distinction usually taken between physical and moral is annulled."‡

It is difficult to contemplate steadily this mass of inferences, and decide where we shall begin to except to such sweeping generalizations. Sometimes there seems a flippancy in the statement of the most amazing positions, which it is very apparent could not have been in the author's thought. Sometimes the expressions are very loose, and impossible to reconcile with one another. To us, such terms as "discretion," "nobleness," "penitence," and a whole host of similar import, which he freely uses, cannot possibly be made to stand an instant, or signify anything at all, in a system which reduces man's moral and intellectual life to the foreordained unfolding of a law. Then the very

* Vestiges, p. 248. † p. 246. ‡ p. 232.

statement of such an hypothesis, in many parts, is repulsive. To use the author's own words, "There is a monitor within which denies that it is the whole truth. We intuitively shrink from it in its isolated sternness, and demand to know if there are not other truths which require to be associated with it, before it can be received even in its most limited application."* The author is here speaking, in another connexion, of what he had before termed the "sublime simplicity of this indifference" towards special results of an all-comprehending law.

As to the scientific argument brought to sustain the length and breadth of this hypothesis, it must, from the nature of the case, be utterly inadequate. At best, it can only amount to hints and analogies, which will convey an impression wholly different to different minds. We need not review the course of that argument, as it has been carried on in the leading journals of the day. It is sufficient to say that, while demonstration is impossible, the general tenor and bearing of the facts he has adduced from geology and physiology, in illustration of his theory, can never be overthrown; and that some of the writer's opponents have put themselves at a great disadvantage, by attempting to gainsay what they have supposed to be too favorable towards him. We shall refer very briefly to this again.

But suppose the case much more fully made out than perhaps it ever will be. Suppose science succeeds in establishing every adduced fact that can possibly come within its province. Suppose it to be proved, (as it never can be proved,) that the absolute distinction of species and even of genera is fallacious; and that all the tribes of animals, including, for argument's sake, even man, have "ascended" by a continuous line from one primeval stock. Suppose that the process of "manufacturing life in retorts" — which was the anticipatory boast of French chemistry half a century ago, — should become as common as the manufacture of nitrous oxide, or the transmission of electro-magnetic despatches. Suppose all this; what then? Is the dignity or the sacredness of human life in any degree lessened by such a result as this? Has the absolute, uni-

* Vestiges, p. 273.

versal, undeviating supremacy of natural law been proved, in spiritual as well as material things? We think not.

To us it makes no difference in the sacred gift of life, whatever channels of transmission it has passed through, from God the giver. It does not disturb us to be told that the clay was already organized, into which the Creator "breathed the breath of life, so that man became a living soul." The fact, even on this author's hypothesis, remains the same as ever. Man is the summit, the crowning point, of all God's wonderful creation. Taking up and carrying on the mysterious chain of being, his spirit rises with it and leads it back to the Infinite, whence it originally came. We do not understand the reproach cast upon that hypothesis, of reducing man to a level with "vulgar nature;" or the justness of such an epithet, applied to the living universe which is the divine handiwork. At the same time, to our mind there is every evidence of more close, vital and, so to call it, personal operation of the creative Spirit, than the author seems to recognize. Each successive stage of creation is in the strictest sense supernatural to the next below. The "half-reasoning elephant" evidently acknowledges and respects a superior nature in the man. The dog regards his master with an "upward affection," which struck the mind of Coleridge as the only approach, among animals, to the human sentiment of reverence. The monkey will sit, perhaps for hours, turning over the leaves of a book, and gazing on its pages in stupid bewilderment. He will imitate human actions, and try vainly to copy human skill. He will peer most curiously into whatever men are about, and then "fumble and bungle" in doing it after them. He will go through the most ludicrous mimicry, in trying to copy the gestures of a mother's affection for her child. He sees the form, and forever puzzles himself about the meaning. Now these vague analogies between the human and brute mind are not without their significance. The *type*, both of organic structure and mental character, stamped so plainly on every class of living things, had been regarded as the "image and superscription" of the Maker's hand, denoting unity of design throughout, and marking them as parts of one system, before any theory had appeared connecting them organically. And thus regarded, we esteem it very far from irreverent,

to trace the successive unfoldings of organic, intellectual and moral life, as portions of one great whole; or to anticipate the time, when the present average advancement of the human race shall seem but the rude beginning of a glorious and ever widening course.

It is hardly necessary to say, in addition to what has been already said, that the author's theory, even as he understands it, does by no means conflict with any fact dear to the religious mind. It does not deny, any more than gravitation or magnetism denies, the doctrine of inspiration, providence or immortality. All that need be said is, that these doctrines, and any others having a moral or religious import, are to be established on altogether different evidence from any the writer pretends to give; and cannot possibly be overthrown by any doctrine or discovery of science.

The existence and government of God must be assumed, in any conceivable theory of the universe, as its necessary explanation, and the bond of connexion among its parts. And we think that any one, who will form to himself the conception of such a Divine Author as the universe requires, will be compelled to acknowledge that no *a priori* argument can possibly be maintained, from a scientific point of view, making a direct revelation (by which we mean a *personal communication* of God with the human race) in any degree improbable. This, we may add, is distinctly asserted, or implied, in the author's repeated and earnest declarations.

The other question proposed is, whether the facts of man's moral and spiritual life are strictly the necessary development of natural law, — in the same sense as the germination and ripening of a seed of grain are strictly subject to the law of vegetable growth. Here, if we understand the author rightly, we are utterly and irreconcilably opposed to him. In his view, unless he has singularly misrepresented himself, every action of man is as necessary as the falling of a stone or the flow of a river. Virtue and vice, heroism and crime, are but as fruit and blight, beauty and decay, in a rare garden-plant. His system, as he states it, is nothing more or less than the old, perpetually re-appearing one, of the most absolute and entire fatalism. To this we have nothing to oppose, but simple and uncom-

promising denial. It is not so. No possible accumulation of scientific facts and arguments can ever prove it so. We do not mean now to call in question a single fact he has brought for reasoning or illustration. But we say, without the least reserve, that his inference from those facts is wholly unjustifiable and false. For, in any conceivable meaning of those terms, it is an outright denial of the moral nature of man, and the moral signification of life. It is an abandonment and defiance of the very fact most deeply stamped on every human mind, and implied in every word of praise or reproach, every sentiment of admiration or horror, every epithet in every language of man that appeals to the common heart, and in the profound conviction everywhere implanted, of the supremacy of *character* over every other thing. Such complete denial as this of that whole class of facts bearing on the moral nature and destiny of man, is unworthy of one whose boast is, that his science bases itself on facts; and who reproaches the whole class of philosophic minds, that their system "does not so much as pretend to have nature for its basis."* With Plato, the good is the highest and hardest conception of all. "In scientific inquiry," he says, "the idea of good is the last of all, and with difficulty to be seen."† We understand this idea to be utterly denied and "ignored," by one who takes the view our author does of good and evil.

We have stated, as strongly as we can, our entire dissent from the theory offered here to account for the facts of man's moral nature. It is not a process of argument, but a primitive, absolute conviction, which we oppose to it. It is what Kant has well called the "categorical imperative," which can in no wise be for a moment departed from. It is as certain as any fact, any axiom, or any step of ratiocination, in natural science, can possibly be. The questions bearing upon it are of an order wholly distinct, the axioms and method are distinct, and the results to be attained equally distinct, from anything proposed in scientific inquiry. When we come to deal with character, motives, and the freedom of the human will, we are on ground that physics cannot reach. And it is thoroughly unscientific, for any one to deny the validity of the facts or reasonings which

* Vestiges, p. 227. † Rep. B. VII. p. 517.

we here assume. To the Infinite Mind the two departments of physical and moral truth may be one and the same. Science and philosophy, so seen, may be blended in one. The more perfectly their respective results are attained, the more nearly are they found to coincide. But to the mind of man, the two can never become identical; and least of all will we assent to that process, which would simplify the matter by merging either of them in the other.

We have said that we do not mean to deny a single fact of science brought to bear on the argument. We seek and welcome whatever can be set in clearer light by the investigations of physiology, or the statistics of human life. Discoveries of this sort have a value, which we would not once think of rejecting or denying. But they do not touch upon the fundamental facts of human will and human responsibility. All they can ever do, is to show the limitations of the will and the extent of the responsibility. They mark out — the more clearly and definitely, the better — the conditions and circumstances of man's moral life; but that life itself they neither create, gainsay nor define. They display to us facts of the same order as the crippling of a limb, or the delirium of a fever; which have nothing to do with the normal state of our moral being. Phrenology itself, or Neurology, (granting them both proved,) can do no more than this; for either is but a curious and obscure branch of Physiology. As soon as either assumes to be more than this, and to usurp the province of Ethics or Metaphysics, it is futile and false. At most, they can tell us of the physical limitations to mental phenomena; and to our mind they rather suggest the bounds which restrain and hamper the operations of spirit, than speak of the essence of human character and life. Precisely the same thing may be said of the arguments drawn from climate, race, circumstances, disease, and the like. All these only show how the limits may vary, expanding or contracting as the human element is more or less developed; but by no means reduce human action within the category of natural things. For the soul, in however humble degree, is a creative spirit, like its Maker. We are compelled to judge its acts on the assumption, that they proceed from its own originating agency; and hence it is, as Coleridge well remarks, "a contradiction in terms," to ascribe them to natural law.

We have been thus distinct upon this point, because we hold it to be first of all important, to protest against the encroachments of science or of its supporters, when unwarrantably interfering, though in the smallest degree, with the province of spiritual truth. We consider it, moreover, of the highest moment, that science and philosophy should fairly understand their mutual position, so that each may help and not hinder the other in their common pursuit of truth. We are the more impelled to make this protest, because it seems imperative on the philosophic mind to withstand the subtilizing materialism that grows, naturally enough, out of the amazing discoveries of modern science, and justifies itself by perpetual appeals to the "vanishing lines" of scientific investigation. This tendency, as we are deeply convinced, cannot be met any otherwise, than by re-asserting, most positively and distinctly, (with all the modifications, indeed, required by the actual state of science,) the primitive absolute doctrine of the freedom of the human soul. The personal element, the spiritual force, pervades, interpenetrates and characterizes all its action; just as much as the sun's light transforms the drifting cloud, or as electricity is present in every chemical operation in the vast laboratory of the universe. Neither philosophy nor science can give any quarter, or live in mutual respect and peace, until the bounds of each are distinctly acknowledged, and the province of each is clearly understood.

Doubtless, in saying this, we conflict with the assertions and the arguments contained throughout the works under review. But we do not see how it can clash with the writer's unconscious conviction, if he means what he constantly and inevitably implies. For his labor, as he tells us, had a moral purpose in view. It was for the sake of doing good, of rousing reflection, of startling by momentous truths, and quickening the sense of responsibility, — not for the sake of idly promulgating a barren theory,—that he came thus before the public.* We speak with the greater freedom, therefore, of the fallacy involved; which in our view is more mischievous, in its theoretical and practical results, than any other obtruded by the supporters of any half-way theory whatever. It is the real ground of the scruples and

* See Vestiges — Concluding note; and especially Sequel, p. 130.

objections that have been raised against his hypothesis. Other objections are comparatively slight. This, if once made out and carried to its legitimate results, is fatal. And it is against any supposed immoral tendency of his speculations, that he seeks most earnestly to vindicate himself in his reply.

We need not go at large into the merits of the controversy. As is well known, almost every position he has adduced, for fact or illustration, has been contested. The "Sequel" is an elaborate reply to the criticisms especially of the Edinburgh and North British Reviews. While he acknowledges the scientific attainments of the reputed authors of these criticisms, which to very many minds have seemed quite decisive of his merits, the writer undertakes to meet and refute every objection they have urged. He begins with an exposition of his original design, and a defence of the nebular hypothesis from the supposed contradiction of recent discoveries. Next he makes his assertion, that "the workings of the little world of the human mind — the opposite extreme of the system — are under law likewise." The next and largest portion of his "explanation," occupying more than fifty pages, is taken up with a labored reply to the assertion of the Edinburgh Review, that no indubitable traces of the regular succession of gradations of being can be found in the geological series. So far as one not an adept may be permitted to judge, it would seem that he very successfully vindicates his assertion, of what till this controversy few had ever doubted, — that there is a general and steady progression to be observed, with a little obscurity as to its precise steps and limits. These considerations, however, are only preliminary and subordinate. He goes on to defend his physiological positions; to assert the genuineness of the experiments of Messrs. Crosse & Weeks,* which have called forth much controversy and derision, and which are here given in detail, in an appendix; and to treat of several minor points, which are, or which are thought to be, involved in his general design; together with the supposed moral bearing of this and similar processes of thought. We pass all by, with this slight notice, because to our mind they are in no way implicated

* The supposed generation of a species of mite by an electric current.

in the questions that concern us, further than they have already been discussed.

One word in conclusion. If the respectable publishers of this edition are afraid to reprint a work of supposed heretical tendency, without an accompanying attack upon its opinions, — if they feel it incumbent upon them to satisfy the religious public and their own conscience, without losing the opportunity of being first in the market with a highly popular work, — why can they not, in consideration of the good sense of the community, if not as a mark of decent respect to the author by whose labors they increase their gains, give a reply of fair scientific ability, thus enabling their readers to judge of the real merits of the case; rather than prefix the dull absurdity and clumsy ridicule of the "Introduction," they have seen fit to insert? With this single interrogatory we take leave of our task.

J. H. A.

Art. III. — ARGUMENTS FOR IMMORTALITY.

The teachings of nature are revelations from God. They may not, indeed, be so clear to the mind enfeebled through mistakes and sins, as to man with his nature wholly developed; yet they are full of power and beauty. We may be startled at an expression, which compares the revelations of nature with the authoritative declarations of Jesus Christ. The fearful importance of religious truth, and the neglect with which it has been regarded by men without the instructions of Jesus, lead us to turn to his words exclusively, as our only refuge, and to disparage all other means by which God seeks to instruct us. That spirit which drew a lesson of contentment from the birds of heaven, and stooped to borrow illustrations of Divine Providence from the lilies of the field, recognized the presence of the great Creator in all things, and referred our minds to the wide world around us, to the heavens above, to reason, to conscience, to affection, to the soul, as uttering the voice of God. The Gentiles heard this voice, when they obeyed the law written upon their hearts. The Psalmist of Israel devoutly listened to it, upon the house-top, before

he tuned his harp to sing of the heavens, declaring the glory of God.

We cannot disparage nature, without disparaging God. We may, indeed, think lightly of what men sometimes consider to be nature, and of the lessons which a careless reasoning propounds: as the traveller from the mountain-top may carelessly regard the landscape, whose loveliness is concealed by mist, and the mariner near the pole may pronounce the magnet a useless needle. But the more devoutly our hearts have been impressed by the miracles and words of Jesus, the more reverently, also, we regard the broad light of God's truth, which shines through all the world. The stillness of night, in the solitary chamber, as the Christian looks out upon the skies and upon a world asleep under the Providence of God, awakens the deep devotion of his mind: while the drunken straggler thoughtlessly shouts his folly forth, and the careless and selfish spirit finds the goodly canopy of the stars a mere sight for a showman, or "a pestilential congregation of vapors." Indeed, it is only when we feel that the world is but a form to God the soul, a mirror reflecting the mind of God, that the world is ever more than a form to us. Religion is the source of its beauty. It is only when man, the spirit, looks upon the mountain and the sea, that grandeur and beauty and poetry exist.

The strong impulses of nature are widely different from the impulses of man, the creature of art, the distorted work of vice. The mother, who silences the deep throbbing of her heart, as she looks upon her sleeping infant, and labors and prays for its good, finds that her affections teach her some duties as solemnly as her nature can understand. In general, it is only when we see the full harmony of our original natures with the teachings of revelation, that the commandments of the Scripture come with power to the soul. It is not the work of amusement, to show the identity of nature with revealed religion. It is not impiety, to rest with deep confidence upon the utterance of the voice of God in the soul. It is not deism, to gather from the world the intimations of our immortality. The faculty of reason cannot be more happily employed, than when of ourselves we judge what is right, and find our judgment confirming the teachings of Jesus, opening the eye of the

understanding more fully to receive the light, which had hitherto shone like day, but shone upon our blindness.

That the desire of immortal existence is felt by the human heart, is proof to the reflecting mind of the immortality of man. Continued existence is the deep desire of all. Immersed, indeed, in the cares of life, or in remorseful pleasures, it is not the thought of the joys of heaven and a life in the manifest presence of God and of angels, that is calling us forward. It is not the distant future, perhaps, which leads on any one. The idea of ages upon ages rolling away, and ages upon ages still presenting their faint forms in eternity of succession, is too vast for the human mind wholly to comprehend: as we pursue it, we feel that we tread upon the borders of the infinite: we believe, not because we can see, but because it is impossible wholly to escape from seeing. To most persons, the spiritual world may seem an abstraction; but death is worse than all abstractions. Life to-day leads on the wish for life to-morrow. We complain of life, but we cannot resign it. The infirmities of age lead men to be reconciled to death, — not to view it with that natural contentment, with which the heart welcomes the object of its love. In the severer trials and the disappointments of human existence, men prefer their sufferings to the extinction of consciousness. The light of the sun still reveals to them a beautiful world, and even night pours around them a peacefulness too pleasing to be resigned. The convict, nursed in crime, brought up to intimate familiarity with the hauntings of remorse, confined for weary days to his own reflections within the solitude of the cell, hears with terrible misgiving the stroke of the bell which announces the preparations for his death, and as he labors to walk with his gaoler to the scene of his death, pleads earnestly and bitterly for life. Those who have had no instruction from man in the hope of immortality, do not arrive at the time when they are willing to die. In the excitement of battle, when reflection is prevented, they may dare to face the danger of dying; in the disappointment of earthly pride, and the emptiness of soul, under which the vicious fall distracted, — in the ignorance which has never known of spiritual joys, nor supposed that man could arrive at happiness higher than that of animal gratification, — men have been found to pass away not unwillingly

from the world. Still, in ignorance, disappointment and remorse, many who have passed from life, have bid the world good-bye as a loving friend, who had been strangely alienated, and to whose embraces their fond hearts yearned for permission to return.

The love of life is the desire of immortality. It is not in this scene or in that, that I ask to spend my days. The distant star may be a dwelling of delight to me, or the world I live in. It may be indifferent to me, in what separate apartment of God's infinite mansion I may pass existence; but I would live, I would not resign this pleasing being to-day. I have hopes for the evening, I have plans for the morrow: and when to-morrow comes, my mind, thoughtless of death, unable, without violence done to the course of thought, to prepare for the end of being, runs for other days and weeks and years, and imagines the future of God still extending before me, with works of usefulness in which I would engage. How is man reconciled to die? Take away his hope of immortality, and the grave has a victory over him, which it shocks him to contemplate. The worst ills which he can endure, the pangs with which unrepented iniquity shall visit him, will all be needed to bring him to submit to the triumphs of death. The good, the happy, without the hope of immortality, cannot sustain the view of death. The great mass of the world, which is not to be deemed remorseful or miserable, cannot endure the thought of death, except in the hope of resurrection. Men desire life; they desire life that shall never end. Death is an evil too dread to contemplate; nature shrinks back with shuddering at the thought, abhors and denies it.

The desire of life is considered the strongest of human desires. It has been supposed universal. It is believed to be an instinctive desire in the human heart. But if it is admitted that the desire for life is one which the Author of our nature has implanted, it must be admitted also that it is one which he will not disappoint. What other native desire fails of opportunity for fulfilment? What other prompting of nature is found false and wrong? Nature inspires us with the love of knowledge. It is developed in early childhood, and exhibited in the latest hours of age. But in every year of life, and in every period of the world,

nature is unfolding to man the vast volume of her works, and leading him to the secret recesses where her jewels of truth are hid. Individuals, indeed, are sometimes disappointed in the gratification of peculiar wishes; but man, in general, finds the means of gratifying all his desires. The world is fitted to him, and he to the world. If, on the other hand, whenever man with his earnest mind looked forth for knowledge, mystery and darkness continually rose before his view, and when his trembling affections called upon human love, every source of earthly sympathy was found to be closed, and men passed by smiling in indifference or laughing in scorn; or when the demands of his physical nature sought wholesome food, the mellow fruits of earth turned continually to dust and ashes in his mouth; we might then believe that one desire more, even the strongest, is destined to disappointment, too. But finding the means provided to answer every other call of man's nature, we believe that the last great call, the prayer for life, will be answered also. If the grave is the last scene of human existence, the nature of man is not fitted to the state in which he is placed. If man is not to live again, his heart has not been rightly attuned in its many thousand strings. It was not kind to give him conceptions of a higher world and desire for its enjoyment, and lead him forward only to disappoint him by shifting the bright vision away. Nor is it possible for us to believe, that God, the great Artificer, whose works exhibit the height of wisdom and the perfection of harmony, can have made the human heart discordant with human life, and inspired it with a desire, gratuitous, and, if not about to enjoy its promised gratification, useless and injurious to its peace.

But nature still further teaches our immortality, by having rendered it difficult for us to conceive of death. One would think that when the dying fall daily around us, proofs so clear are granted to us of our own frailty, that the thought of our being about to die must of all convictions be living and profound. Yet it is with difficulty that we draw nigh to the thought of our death. We are fully able to conceive of scenes of life and enjoyment; we draw bright pictures of the lot which in a few short years will fall to us. We can easily conceive of various disappointments, and bright hopes fading away. We can, indeed,

conceive of a dreadful time, when lover and friend will be put far away from us, when the light of the stars will be extinguished, and darkness and the grave and earth shall be our dwelling-place and our fate; but all the terrors of the grave come from one strong conviction, that we live to experience them. What matters it to the senseless clod, whether it is inurned in marble, laid down to sleep under the grass-green turf, or lost in the waves of the ocean? Why do we care whether flowers bloom above the place of our repose, and father and mother, or son and daughter and friend, wear away the sod which covers our remains, if we have no sense of honor paid us, no thought of indifference and neglect? But men are careful of their tombs; they shudder at death, because they think of the continuance of their conscious being, and cannot separate themselves from the thought of life. Labor as we may, we cannot conceive of nothingness. Leave others uninspired by conceptions of heaven or hell, by thoughts of the activity and labor, the joys and sufferings of a spiritual world, and their minds linger around the body in the tomb, and believe in its unspeakable suffering, till it has mingled with the formless dust. We undertake slow work, when we attempt to persuade men that they will surely die. Nature in our hearts, and in them, continually denies the lessons which we are giving, and answers, 'Man shall die no more.' Philosophers have wondered that men are slow to receive the lesson; religionists have complained of it, and the pious have mourned over it. But daily as the example of death is presented, eloquently, earnestly as the preacher may declaim of the time appointed to die and the narrow house for all the living, the busy throng pass out from the sanctuary and away from the coffin, and the first bright look of the world, and sense of health in the pure air of heaven, banish the lesson which the coffin had presented and the preacher had laboriously endeavored to enforce. Why should it be so difficult to convince men of mortality? Why should we feel inability to conceive of death's approach? Are we rendered blind by nature to the great truths which shall be? Are we prevented by nature from dwelling upon that, which, if true, is the most wonderful of all truths? It is because we do not die, that we do not conceive of death. It is because God, the eternal Father

of the soul, does not intend that we shall conceive of death. We never die: we pass from scene to scene in existence. We rise from glory to glory, or we pass to greater degradation. There is no death; and we cannot teach men to believe what God has inspired them to deny.

How easy to persuade men that they are to live a little longer, and a little longer, until only in the hour of mortal dissolution they begin to imagine our kind encouragements deceptions. In sicknesses of great pain the name of death is called upon, but the mind is too much excited and disturbed to understand the meaning of the call. In much of mortal illness the senses are too far withdrawn, to enable the mind to enquire after life or death. But in illness when no great pain is endured, and the bodily senses are left unimpaired in their acuteness, the pale consumptive talks of life, and his eye burns brightly with hope, his heart beats strongly with affection. The extinction of his being is as far from his thought as from yours and mine. We bid him farewell, but he expects our return to-morrow: or the full sense of existence inspires him with the consciousness of immortal life, and he appoints our meeting in the eternal world. Let the preacher, with the sign of mortal disease burning in his cheek, arise to address us upon immortal hopes, and though we gaze upon his attenuated form and see, as it were, the sinews of his life moment by moment divided, yet as he presents to us a view of heavenly existence, and tells of labors yet to be undertaken, love to be enjoyed through ages unending, our hearts involuntarily echo to the sound. His soul triumphs over the body. We see him turning to a spiritual existence before our gaze. We believe in the spirit's existence, though we look upon the body's death.

The thought of spiritual existence, perhaps, has never been believed in so little in any age as in the present. Yet we are by no means passing into general skepticism. The Indian believed in the Great Spirit; Naiads and Dryads filled wood and flood to the ancient; and in later days, the fairy and elf were sweeter ideas, flowing from the spirituality of the popular mind, than the genius of the student-poet could invent. Death has made no part of the popular conception of spiritual beings, and shortly it will make no part of our conception of ourselves. It is the body that

dies. "I cannot believe it," is the first exclamation of the survivor, when the intelligence of his friend's death is brought to him. Well, we ought not to believe him dead; we ought not to try to believe him dead. We are not called upon to believe it: why should we make the vain struggle to believe it true? Let nature have her way. Suffer the voice of God to be heard within the heart, above the voice of men, who have been deceived by the passing show of death. Gone? Yes! the familiar voice is gone; but the kindness, which prompted it, survives: the familiar features will not beam again, in this world, with the smile of love; but the affection, which alone we regarded in them, lives, and will forever live, and will animate other spiritual features, of light and beauty such that pain can never shade them, nor death have power to disturb. Death may be for the world which is around us. The leaves may fall; the waves of the ocean rest from their tumultuous flow; the stars of heaven, perhaps, which angels, it would seem, might descend from their sphere to gaze upon with rapture, may cease to emit unneeded rays: but man survives the ruins of the outward world, and rises to a purer existence. Cease to tell us, we must die. Do not point to the graves of kindred. They are not there. They never were there. They looked down with compassion, when with tears, and sobs and anguish for ourselves, we conveyed with many tokens of respect their bodies to the tomb, and with their light wings they passed close by the faces they had loved, and strove to burst the airy bondage of the spiritual world, to tell how happy it is to die. Tell us not of *death:* if you would persuade us to be good, tell us of the blessedness of life with God; if you would deter us from sin, tell us of the living soul, alive to its Maker, absent from his smiles.

But some say that we see men die, and therefore must believe in death. But from the death of the body, we cannot draw the conclusion that our being becomes extinct. Upon reflection, we become convinced that we never saw death, and that it is beyond the bounds of knowledge yet acquired, that a man who has once lived has ever died. 'The spirit has left its earthly abode:' — we cannot penetrate further into the mystery of death. The tenant of some earthly dwelling packs up his goods, and removes with wife and children to a distant abode: we believe that he still

lives, though we knock at his door in vain, find no marks around of labor lately pursued, and see no light at evening glimmering from the window. And if our eye-sight is destroyed, so that we can no longer look forth upon the world, and the avenue of hearing is sealed, and the world sends back no tokens of its existence, we can yet believe that other beings *are*. They may have senses and means of communication, which we have not. The dead, who have been silently removed beyond the reach of sense, may have means of communication of which our uninstructed minds cannot conceive. To them a whole world of spirits may be open. All beings who have lived, may have seen and known them. Have we seen them die? We have only seen them depart from their accustomed habitation, and, with our feeble vision, were unable to follow them upon the path which they pursued.

We cannot see them in their new abode. But we must honestly admit, we never *saw* them here. We looked upon the form; but it was not marble, which walked forth in majesty, and the blush upon the cheek bore no relationship to the changes of mere clay. We saw the eye, but never the spirit, which lighted it with emotion and made use of its glance. We never saw the spirit in its happiness, though we remember with fond delight the smile with which its happiness was told. How little of any man do we ever see! By familiar intercourse and long observation, we think at last that we understand his principles, his impulses, himself. Yet tacitly, to ourselves, we admit that we may be mistaken in our estimate of his character, for we have had no visible acquaintance with him. The mariner, wrecked at sea, after enduring the storm of the elements for days and nights in his open boat upon an unknown ocean, is brought by the waves at last to approach a shore, and in the dimness of night, when he can scarcely discern its outline and can discover no human beings, he learns from scattered lights set up to show his way, that he is to find a home among a civilized and hospitable people. And we, too, learn what manner of people they are, with whom we daily associate, not because we see them, but because the eye traces the outline of their forms, and the mind watches their motions and observes their conduct. If we saw the *soul*, in which alone character resides, not

through long study, but at a glance, we should understand the affections and principles of the man. We can only say of the dead, the spirit makes no signs to us; it sets up no friendly light to assure us of its existence, and presents no token to inform us that we sail over the waves of an inhospitable life, to be welcomed to a share in its blessedness. The experience of every night and morning should teach us a lesson of immortality. We separate from the friends we love, and have no means of knowing, in the hours of darkness, that they are not all in the spirit-land. Morning restores them to us. They lived, though we had no cognizance of their life. The departed have left us, by ourselves, each in his narrow chamber here: but, when morning dawns in a world that knows no night, we, whom *they* have lost, will be restored to them. We are living, though perhaps they know it not; they, too, may be living, though we cannot behold them.

Man's progressive nature justifies the Christian's belief in immortal existence. Every path marked out by man leads, or is intended to lead, to some useful end; when we enter upon a road, we expect its size and excellence to lead to a place commensurate with the pains bestowed upon its construction. Every affection, every capacity of the human soul is boundless. The heart is never filled with loving, the mind is never satiated with knowing. Answer the questions of the curious child; will it ask no more? Teach us the science we would learn; will the love of knowledge be extinguished by your teachings? On the other hand, the love of knowledge grows by being gratified. The philosopher, who has spent many years in the serious pursuit of truth, is moved by a love which has grown stronger with every year; and when he is humbled, at the last, by the consciousness of the little that he knows, it is only because he sees a world opened around him, into which he longs to penetrate. We never attempt to estimate how much his mind can contain. He would ascend, if it were possible, to the highest stars; he would open the lowest depths of earth; he would encompass the world; he would know all history, art should take to him all her curious inventions to be examined, nature should display before him all her sublimity and beauty and strangeness; the heart of man should open all its secret stores, and the soul lead him to its hid-

den sources of every misery and every joy. But how is he limited in this world by the impossibility of supplying his demands! He is opposed by barriers, which he cannot pass. Ought not the love of knowledge to be extinguished, when a certain amount of knowledge has been attained? Ought it to have been created at first so strong, and always liable to increase with the gratification of its wants? Man needs a life of immortality, before his desire of knowledge shall be filled. He is not suited to this world. Immortality is required to explain the mystery we discover in the illimitable thirst for knowledge bestowed by the Creator.

And the human heart is equally capacious of affection. Its love is not extinguished, when it meets the objects of its love. Give us friends, let us purify our hearts from selfishness, and exalt them to their purest, truest state, — then the affections expand and become illimitable. The heart then loves, not the few alone, with whom it happily bears the burdens and enjoys the pleasures of the world, but man. Wisdom, goodness everywhere bind its attachment. It loves the ignorant, that it may enlighten them; the hardened and the sensual, that it may redeem them. Its capacity has become increased by every effort made to improve it: and at the hour of seeming death, the man of goodness is better prepared for life, better prepared to do good and to enjoy existence, than at any previous period of his being. Can we believe, then, that all the virtue, all the knowledge, all the love, which he has attained, shall be rendered useless, just at the moment of being fitted for the highest usefulness? Can the potter break the vessel, which he has just formed upon the wheel, and beautified by all the adornments which his skill could fashion, and made precious through the exercise of taste and expense of labor? Or the statuary shatter the marble, carved so exquisitely that it expresses the loftiest emotions of the soul, and seems about to speak and to act them? Neither shall we believe that he who made the heart a harp of many thousand strings, and tuned it each year to richer harmonies, and raised the mind to loftiest powers of thought, can rudely destroy the work of his spirit, and offer the ruins of its hopes as fit subjects of scorn for demons of a lower world.

Man cannot die, when he is most fitted to live. The wise and the virtuous, laboring for the good of man, honored

and beloved, filling spheres of usefulness, into which no earthly footsteps can enter, if they are removed, do not die: they are called, as the reward of their labors, to cooperate with God in a higher scene of being, — perhaps to pursue, with powers immeasurably increased, the work which they had loved on earth; and, though unseen and without the credit of men, successfully accomplish what as men they never could have performed. Service more noble, service in which their deep desire to be useful shall be more effectual, is committed to their faithfulness. If death, on the other hand, is the end of being, what an inexplicable mystery is the world! Human thought can find no wisdom in the Creator: he has made a path, which leads to no end. In all other works of God we find appropriateness, but none in man. The stalk decays, when it is no longer needed to bear the ripened seed; but it lives until the seed is ready to fall, with the promise of a future harvest. Every object in nature, the brute, the bird, is fitted to its station. But man sets forth upon the sea of knowledge, vast beyond conception, and his voyage is a shipwreck, almost at its commencement. The heart is full of affection, and every friend departs, and we at last lie down in the grave to look back upon a world, in which every valuable hope has been disappointed. We are religious beings; the light of God's throne continually, amidst all the labors, joys, and trials of life, breaks through the skies and clouds to gild our path: and religion, God, is nothing to us, unless in another world our connexion with God is rendered perfect, and the Object of our reverence and our love is brought continually more nigh. We cannot believe that God is, and not believe man immortal.

Belief in immortality seems to be necessary for the full development of man according to his nature, and still more for his redemption, when once he has been subject to moral evil. If there is a thought, without which the destiny of man cannot be fulfilled, that thought is true. If without it there is no courage, or hope is materially impaired, and principle despoiled of its strength, — if with it nature returns in all its power, and man seems placed in natural relationships with himself, and life in highest excellence moves easily on, — if there *be* truth, that thought is true. But do we, can we, find man securely advancing to the highest

excellence, without belief in immortality? Perhaps ancient philosophers believed it more than they were aware of. Minds, with so little affinity to earth, could not else have looked upon death with calmness; and purity and impurity would have shed upon their dying hours an equal peace or equal indifference. In the midst of the struggles of man after goodness, goodness ceases to own more than half its value, if it be not immortal. True, in this life the soul is; and enjoys and suffers according to its deserts. But the labor of advancing to excellence is great; and if to-morrow, or within the compass of a few short years, our labors are rendered valueless, they lose the chief source of their interest now. A great mind cannot labor in that which is wholly transitory. Hurried on by passion, fixed in evil determinations, calling evil good and good evil, proud of wisdom when overwhelmed in ignorance, man, without the thought of immortality, is ruined. His sense of self-respect destroyed, indifferent to the sufferings of wife and children, careless of the entreaties of friends, conscious, but reckless of the destruction of earthly hopes and the prospect of degradation and ruin, man has no means of redemption. As mortal, he has no responsibility; and to him, God is not. It is only when he sees his guilt and sin and misery stretching illimitable ages into the future, it is only when he must live, and there is no escape from life and the ill of life, but by one single course, that of repentance, that redemption seems possible. The hope of annihilation, the dim thought that by some means without goodness his misery shall be stayed, renders him weak to all exhortations from without and for all endeavors from within. It is only when he sees himself in the arms of an iron fate, by one prayer only to be unlocked, — or in the storm of whirling waves, without support, with depth immeasurable under him, and one star only above to direct his course, — that he can be saved. No human power can bear comparison in its tyranny to the reckless sway of moral evil; no conception of supernatural malignancy surpasses the authority to which the hopelessness of the sinful soul is subjected. It is not by a choice of means that redemption can be achieved. One way only is open, — the thought of evil, too great, too long continued for human endurance, if guilt continue, — the thought of bliss too

rich, too tearful, too long continued for human conception, if guilt be brought to an end. Heaven opens wide "her ever-during gate, on golden hinges moving," and all that poet could foretell, or religion itself attempt to convey to our feeble imagination, presents itself to the ready faith, the joyful acceptance of the repenting soul. Repentance becomes possible in the thought of immortality. Without it, who has ever escaped from the folds of the serpent, or broken through the iron gates that shut him in to misery? The truth of immortality is proved by its necessity to the soul; it is the one thought, by which man's destiny is possible of achievement.

We do not suppose, that we have presented arguments for believing in the immortality of the soul, which are not elsewhere accessible. Our work is accomplished, if we have brought together what is scattered, or prepared in a new form what our readers may not have elsewhere read, nor have given birth to in their own minds. The doctrine of immortality cannot be set forth too often. However firm may be our faith in the miracles and words of Jesus, it must be a source of satisfaction to us, to read the same testimony written by the finger of Almighty God upon the world around us, and the soul within. The argument from nature, however powerfully set forth, can never tend to invalidate the claims of Jesus, when we consider that it is only by his light that we are first inspired with a wish, and gifted with power, to read the record, which for ages had been hidden in darkness.

But the faith which we need in immortality, is a faith of the heart, such as no mere arguments, whether drawn from the page of nature or the teachings of Jesus, can alone sufficiently inspire. All good thoughts claim kindred one with another. He who believes obeys; but it is not less true, that he who consents to obey finds himself able to believe. The soul, with many ties which bind it in the ways of selfishness, cannot ascend the heights from which the land of spirit-life may be seen. Impetuous in passion and remorseful, it is not calm enough to estimate the view. When the deep peace of self-sacrifice, of generous love and strict obedience, fills the mind, then comes in the intuitive conviction of the immortality of our being. The soul ascends in conscious grandeur. Conscious of present

greatness, it cannot admit the thought of littleness and death. Active, earnest, useful, it feels too much its harmony with the universe, its atonement with God, to imagine that God can be so *strange* as to disappoint its high hopes, and destroy the power of its joyous affections. Our faith in immortality is a moral faith. In all the teachings of Christ he implies that the good believe themselves immortal, as well as urges upon the impenitent their immortality in ill. E. B.

Art. IV. — FUNDAMENTAL LAWS OF REASONING.*

Theology, more than other sciences, needs the aid of logic, for in no other science do we find greater diversity of opinion, and more inconclusive reasoning. How often in listening to theological discussions from the pulpit does the false logic of the preacher make us ask with Tully, "An tu dialecticis ne imbutus quidem es?" — have you never studied the art of reasoning? We trust therefore, that a brief review of Mr. Mill's work will not be inappropriate to the pages of a theological journal. But we must first say a few words of some other recent treatises on the same, or a similar subject.

Whately's Logic, originally published in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, takes Aristotle as its guide, and maintains that the syllogism is the type, or the formula of all reasoning. Logic, says Whately, is the science and art of Reasoning; all reasoning must from its very nature be syllogistic; and therefore a complete exposition of the syllogism is a complete treatise on Logic strictly so called. He accordingly gives a clear and full exposition of the syllogism, and of the fallacies arising from a violation of its rules. Here he conceives the business of logic to be ended, and in his subsequent remarks on the province of reasoning and discovery of truth, he makes induction to be, so far as it is argumentative, syllogistic; so far as not syl-

* *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive; being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific Investigation.* By John Stuart Mill. London. 1843. 2 vols. pp. 1204. New York. 1846. 8vo. pp. 593.

logistic, not argumentative. That which may be learned of nature, without syllogisms, depends, according to Whately, altogether on the genius of the man, and his processes cannot be reduced to rule. This would make a proper logic of induction impossible, and the only thing which could aid the student of nature would be a better education of the observing powers.

The only new truths which man can attain, according to Whately, are those discovered by sense or revealed by testimony. For those truths which are unfolded by reasoning were contained in the premises, and he who had admitted the premises had admitted the deduced truths. It must be confessed, Whately adds, that the man who admitted the premises, did not know that he knew the deduced truths. Nevertheless, that he did know them, is manifest both from the nature of the syllogism and from the fact, that when you teach a man to deduce them, he does not thank you for the information, but merely remarks, "True, I did not think of that," implying that he might have thought of it.

Strange doctrine this, that the splendid deductions of mathematics are not new truths, that the "Disquisitiones Arithmeticæ" of Gauss, for example, contain nothing absolutely new to any man who has but acknowledged that the sums of equals are equal, and the differences of equals are equal. Strange doctrine, — however it may be explained, and whatever sense may be put upon the words "new" and "knew;" in whatever way it may be said, that the theorems of the Calculus are not new to a boy beginning to study them, that he knew them before.

Mr. Whewell was not contented with logic as applied merely to the exposition of the syllogism. Perceiving, what no man can fail to see, that the mathematical and physical sciences are a far more splendid monument of man's reason, than any thing which has been attained or is likely to be attained in the departments of theology and metaphysics, or even political economy and law, he saw the necessity of making his analysis of the reasoning power include an explanation of the processes which had there been so successful. Yet, awed by the manner in which logicians had declared the syllogism to embrace all reasoning, he dared not call his work a logic, but only "A Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences."

Whewell saw clearly the incompleteness, and many of the other defects, of Bacon's "Novum Organon." That work was a first essay, made at a time when physical science was in its infancy, made by a man whose habits of mind, whose bold fancy, and wide sweeping range of thought somewhat unfitted him for the work, and made, too, amid the multifarious and distracting cares of a busy life. Yet Whewell was by no means ungrateful either towards Bacon, or towards a contemporary laborer in the same field, Sir J. F. W. Herschel. He only sought to make additions to their fair structure, and complete its beauty.

Whewell's Philosophy may be termed "transcendental." By this we mean, that he asserts the power of the mind to originate ideas independently of sensation, and believes that ideas so originated have objective realities corresponding thereto. His definition of "induction" makes it—the inducing an idea among a mass of facts to collocate and arrange them. Accordingly he considers it the first business in induction, to gather together the facts on the subject, either from reading, or what is better, from observation; the second, to make some hypothesis respecting them; and the third, to see whether the hypothesis will lead to the results already known as facts. If it do lead to these, and to none inconsistent with observed facts, the induction, according to Whewell, is complete; the hypothesis which was induced, or brought in to explain the facts, must itself be regarded as a fact. Hence the prime requisite of a physical philosopher is, that he have clear and appropriate conceptions:—clear, that he may distinctly see to what results his hypotheses will lead; and appropriate, that those results may be the observed facts.

Such is the whole business of induction, according to Whewell; and he attempts to show it by the history of the physical sciences. Kepler, says, he introduced the conception of an ellipse, etc. among the positions of the planets, and found it accounted for them all; Newton introduced the conception of a force proportional to the square of the distance, and found it explained Kepler's laws; and so in like manner with all other great discoveries since the world began.

But the conceptions formed by the mind, and introduced among its ideas of sensation to school them, are not so

numerous as might at first sight appear. They can be reduced, even according to Mr. Whewell, to a few leading ones in each branch of science, and a few general ones applicable to all sciences. For instance, there are the axioms of Mathematics, which reign over the phenomena of space and time, and the notion of *cause* or *origin*, and *purpose* or *designed end*, which are still more universal. Then in Mechanics there is the idea of force, and a number of axioms respecting it, — that force is proportional to velocity, that the resultant of two forces is the diagonal of their parallelogram, etc. In Chemistry there is the idea of affinity, of chemical quality, of atomic proportion, etc.; in Electricity and its kindred sciences is the idea of polarity; in the Classificatory sciences, the idea of a type, etc. Part of Mr. Whewell's book, and perhaps as valuable a part as any, consists in a collection of aphorisms and axioms; and this is also the most distinctly characteristic portion of it. For he does not use "axiom" in Bacon's sense — of a truth gained by wide generalization; nor in the etymological sense — of a received opinion; but in the narrower signification — of a self-evident proposition. Whether there be any such things as self-evident propositions, is a question which will come up presently, but certainly Whewell greatly exaggerates the number of those that can with any show of reason claim to be such, not only in his "Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences," but also in the "Mechanical Euclid," a little text-book prepared by him.

M. Comte, whose work* we notice chiefly because it is so frequently quoted with great respect by Mr. Mill, maintains that the tendency of science is always towards Atheism. The human mind, he thinks, developes itself, both in the race and in the individual, in three stages. The first is the theological. Then every motion is referred to some unseen spirit. All things that change or move are divine; yea, the very name, deity, signifies "the mover." This theological state goes on towards the perfection of its lie, which it reaches when it ascribes all things to one ever and everywhere present Person, whose will is the cause of all things. The second of these stages is the metaphysical. Then men begin to forget or outgrow their Deism, and seek

* Cours de Philosophie Positive.

for occult qualities in matter to produce phenomena. Then the magnet is said to *attract* iron, and the sun the earth; then compounds are formed by elective *affinities*, and "opium causes sleep by virtue of a soporific quality." This metaphysical state moves on to the perfection of its lie, which it reaches when it has reduced all phenomena to one single law of attraction. Being in itself false, though it is the transition state between the greater falsehood of theology and the state of positive knowledge, it holds some communion with theology, and hence arises a bastard philosophy, inheriting falsehood from each of its parents, the lying philosophy of a lie, namely, theological metaphysics. All metaphysics are in their essence false. For the only foundation of any knowledge is observation, and when we transcend observation we rise into Egyptian darkness, and there form lies to our own fancy, deeming them truths. Nor must psychology be included in observation. Psychology is as false as any metaphysics. For it is plain that we cannot see another's mind, but only his actions; and equally plain that we cannot see our own minds. The eye cannot see itself; the mind cannot be operating, intent on the object of its operation, and at the same time watch itself.

Finally man arrives at the third, the Positive state. Here, becoming wearied with his striving after the winds, he lays hold of that which he can reach. In the positive state he is content with classifying facts observed by the senses. The law of gravitation, for instance, becomes merely an observed law of motion and chemistry, observed laws of combination. Force is considered only in its effects; its origin, and the question of its existence are given up as beyond our reach. Mental science is put away as unattainable, or unintelligible. Ethics are discarded, and Social Physics introduced in their stead. The Social Physics of Comte is simply a classification of observed facts in men's outward conduct, and the deduction of practical laws therefrom. Motives are occult causes, out of the reach of science. This state of positive knowledge will move onward to the perfection of its truth, which it will reach when it has attained, if it ever should, one formula in which it can express all the facts of man's knowledge.

Such is the system of Auguste Comte, one of the most original thinkers and boldest atheists of the present cen-

tury, whose hand is against every man and every man's hand against him; whose development of his principles is so thorough, that he seems to make the very atheists around him but superstitious religionists. It is his writings that seem to have made the deepest impression on the mind of Mill, and to have served as a model on which he formed his style of thought and even of expression. But Mill has not blindly followed Comte. The atheism of the Frenchman was too bold for English ears, too bold even for J. S. Mill, and it appears in Mill's work almost in the garb of religion. True it is, that Mill carefully conceals his religious views; he is writing a book on Logic, that is, as he says, on the laws of evidence, and therefore he has nothing to do with particular points to be proved. Yet it is manifest that, although he believes in the utility of virtue and in the happiness arising from a good conscience and a benevolent heart, he does not think that the laws of evidence justify a man in believing in the existence of God, or in a real distinction between right and wrong.

His book being entitled a System of Logic, he first endeavors to show how much the term, logic, should cover. Reasoning, he thinks, consists in inferring one truth from another. Logicians, to be sure, have said it was inferring a particular case from a general statement, but surely this is false. The burnt child fears the fire, not, surely, from having first said, "All fire will do what the fire which burnt me did;" much less from having risen to a more general truth, that "laws of causation are unchanging in their effects." No! the child simply says, "This fire *looks* like that which burnt me, therefore it will *feel* like it." Does not the child here reason? And wherever reasoning is, it is the province of logic to step in and decide on the validity of the process. Logic is not the science of belief, but it is the science of proof. Its business is to decide, not whether a belief be true, nor whether the evidence for a fact be real, but whether the evidence be sufficient to prove the fact. Deciding thus on the sufficiency of evidence, it is as useful to a man in the formation of his own opinions as it is in examining the arguments of others.

Language being indissolubly associated in our minds with our thoughts, we find it impossible even in thought to

reason without the use of language. As a preliminary, therefore, to the science of logic, Mr. Mill examines language, gives a list of nameable things, and treats of propositions. His remarks on this subject indicate deep thought, but involve some errors.* The remainder of the first Book is taken up by a mixture of excellent remarks upon Classification and Definition, and singular misapprehensions of points of fact.

Book second is on Reasoning. In this Mill gives good grounds for his extended use of the word, and offers a just exposition of the function and value of the syllogism. The admission by Whately and other excellent defenders of the syllogism, that it cannot reveal truth, but merely prevents our ideas from being inconsistent with themselves, and the objection made by Campbell and other writers, that the syllogism is in itself always a *petitio principii*, do not destroy the value of that form of reasoning, but they show it to be strangely misunderstood.

The major premiss always predicates something of a class. But what is a class? Merely the sum of individuals, who each have certain attributes *connoted* by the name of the class. The minor premiss predicates these attributes of certain individuals, that is, brings them under the class, and what is predicated of the class becomes predicated of them.

* Strange it is that men will continue to call particles, "not names, but parts of a name." One would think Horne Tooke's fine ridicule would have forever silenced such language, and that since his day, propositions, conjunctions, articles and adverbs would have been acknowledged as being really names of ideas.

Mill revives the distinction between the connotation and the denotation of names. A name denotes the objects to which it is applied, and connotes their definitive attributives, that is, those attributes the possession of which will make a thing rank among the denoted objects. Then, having made language to be a list of nameable things, he proceeds to classify them. First, says he, there are Feelings or states of consciousness, which may be classed as Sensations, Thoughts, Emotions, and Volitions. Secondly, Substances or entities, of which there are two classes, Body, the cause of sensations, and Mind, the subject of feelings. Thirdly, Attributes. Of the attributes of mind he does not speak. The attributes of body are, first, qualities, i. e. power of producing sensations; secondly, relations, viz. of likeness, of time, of place, of quantity.

Now if these are nameable things, what are the propositions that can be made of them? We may assert, first, their existence, secondly, their order in place, thirdly, their order in time, fourthly, their causes or effects, fifthly, their resemblance. Every proposition is the assertion of some one of these five things, — at least every real proposition is, for the copula, "is," is used sometimes for the verb "means," and the proposition is then only verbal.

This is the analysis of the syllogism; and does it make it to be a process of reasoning? Not at all; but merely a statement of the results of reasoning, that is, the results of the reasoning by which the major term is proved to be an attribute of the middle term, and the minor term is proved to have those attributes which the middle term connotes. The syllogism is merely, then, a statement of reasoning that has formerly been recorded, or rather, the results of which have been recorded in a general form.

The second Book closes with an analysis of the Demonstrative Sciences, and in the third book our author treats of Induction. This he defines to be generalization from experience. The generalizations in regard to space and number are complete and invariable. The triangle will have the sum of its angles equal to two right angles, whether it be made of tin or copper, of a bent pin or by lines joining the fixed stars. Two and three make five, whether they be grains of sand or constellations in the heavens. The inductions here are complete.

But it is in the succession of phenomena that we feel most interest. And there is one induction in regard to succession, that bears this character of universality and invariability. It is, that every effect has a cause, that is, that the antecedents of a phenomenon contain among them some circumstances which are always followed by that phenomenon. For by "cause" in Mill's philosophy is meant an unconditional antecedent.

For the prediction of phenomena we only need a knowledge of their causes, and it is a law of causation that can alone give us any confidence in any prediction or in any explanation of phenomena. Hence the main business of Induction consists in the discovery of causes, that is, in "singling out from among the circumstances which precede or follow a phenomenon, those with which it is really connected by an invariable law."*

* Mr. Mill gives five canons for making this discovery; but speaks of them as four.

First Canon, or "Method of Agreement."

"If two or more instances of the phenomenon under investigation have only one circumstance in common, the circumstance in which alone all the instances agree, is the cause, (or effect) of the given phenomenon." —p. 224.

Second Canon, or "Method of Difference."

"If an instance in which the phenomenon under investigation occurs,

After some excellent chapters on the deductive method, empirical laws, the doctrine of chances, and other subjects, (on which however our author makes a few mistakes), he enters into an examination of the evidence of the law of universal causation, and finds, — most lame and impotent conclusion! — that it rests upon an induction by simple enumeration, and hence is to be relied on only within the limits of our present sphere of knowledge. And so Mr. Mill has been making all induction rest upon the law of causation, the only object being to find causes, and then finds the law of causation itself resting upon a simple enumeration of cases. And the induction by simple enumeration, condemned in such strong terms by Bacon and all thinkers since his day, Mr. Mill among the rest, is by that same Mr. Mill made the most valid of all inductions and the foundation of all the rest!

It will not do; and however Mr. Mill may be able to

---

and an instance in which it does not occur, have every circumstance save one in common, that one occurring only in the former; the circumstance in which alone the two instances differ, is the effect, or cause, or a necessary part of the cause, of the phenomenon."—p. 225.

Joint Canon (3d), or "Joint Method of Agreement and Difference."

"If two or more instances in which the phenomenon occurs have only one circumstance in common, while two or more instances in which it does not occur have nothing in common save the absence of that circumstance; the circumstance in which alone the two sets of instances differ, is the effect, or cause, or a necessary part of the cause, of the phenomenon."—p. 229.

Third Canon (4th), or "Method of Residues."

"Subduct from any phenomenon such part as is known by previous inductions to be the effect of certain antecedents; and the residue of the phenomenon is the effect of the remaining antecedents."—p. 230.

Fourth Canon (5th), or "Method of Concomitant Variations."

"Whatever phenomenon varies in any manner whenever another phenomenon varies in some particular manner, is either a cause or an effect of that phenomenon, or is connected with it through some fact of causation."—p. 233.

These four methods, says Mill, "are the only possible modes of experimental inquiry, of direct induction *a posteriori*, as distinguished from deduction; at least I know not nor am able to conceive any others." "These, then, with such assistance as can be obtained from deduction, compose the available resources of the human mind for ascertaining the laws of the succession of phenomena."

A discussion follows on the comparative value of the four methods. The Method of Agreement is never free from an ambiguity. It evidently can only discover *a* cause of the effect, and if many causes combine, or if many causes are each able to produce it, the Method of agreement leaves them undiscovered. The Joint Method loses some of this uncertainty, and the Method of Difference is the most certain method of all.

conceive of a state in which things came without an apparent cause, that is, without fixed antecedents, no man of any thought, not Mr. Mill himself, can conceive of things coming without a real cause, that is, something which made them come.

But, says Mill, the fact, that we cannot conceive of the nonexistence of a thing, does not prove its existence. Very true it does not *prove* it, if by proving it is meant making its belief equal in certainty to the testimony of consciousness. But it does prove it, if by proving is meant raising its belief to a certainty equal to the testimony of sensation. For sensation proves the existence of a sensible object only on supposition of the veracity of our senses, and in like manner the judgment of the reason proves the truth of anything which it conceives as necessarily existing. Else must the soundness of the reason be impeached; the soundness of reason, — unless the soundness of the particular judgment may be impeached; and for impeaching the judgment acknowledged rules may be framed. And to this point the examples brought by Mill may be reduced. He says, that certain things once held inconceivable may be now conceived. Ay! but would a logical law admitting the inconceivableness of a beginning without a cause admit also the inconceivableness of antipodes, or of gravity without contact?

The truth is, that Mill, in his love of physical science and hatred of metaphysical quibbles, has overlooked the really transcendental element of knowledge. The notion of *cause* comes not by induction of simple enumeration, but from the consciousness of power, the consciousness that we do *cause* in the highest sense. The *universality of the law* of causation is believed on the strength of an induction, but even that is not an induction of simple enumeration. The knowledge of cause coming from the mind, its universality, is proved by an induction drawn also from the consciousness of action, the consciousness that our will is the cause of the movement of things about us.

Mr. Mill having treated of the inductions based on the law of causation, considers the remaining laws of nature.*

* He had before said that five assertions might be made, and five only; Existence; order in Place; order in Time; Causation; and Resemblance. But Causation he afterwards defined as a species of order in Time, and of

We refrain from any remarks upon Book fourth, which treats of operations subsidiary to induction, or upon Book fifth, concerning Fallacies, not because they are unworthy of notice, but because it would detain us too long from the general subject.

In his sixth Book, on the logic of the Moral Sciences, Mr. Mill endeavors to show that the backward state of the moral sciences can only be remedied by applying to them the methods of physical science, duly extended and generalized. For, says he, human actions and character are subject to the law of causality, and although our results may be always to be received as being subject to disturbances, yet laws of mind can be discovered by induction,

---

this he has he thinks sufficiently spoken; having shown the nature of the evidence on which propositions relating to Coexistence and Sequence rest, and the processes of investigation by which they are discovered and proved. There remain three classes of facts; Existence, order in Place, and Resemblance; in regard to which the same questions are now to be resolved.

Regarding Existence however he says but little, and that little is false. For he makes sensible qualities the only proof of existence, and gives us no canons to judge when that evidence is sufficient. Surely sensation alone is not proof enough, else the snakes in the room of a man in delirium tremens exist. Surely sensation is not the only proof of existence, for then nothing but Julius Cæsar's body can be proved to exist and *his* states of consciousness cannot be proved at all, but only his actions. And if Mr. Mill thinks that the inductive Logic has in regard to simple existence no knots to untie, it is because he has narrowed the ground of Logic and made it embrace less than the science of Proof.

He next takes up Resemblance, and decides that Logic has to do only with resemblance in quantity, i. e. mathematical resemblance. On what ground he does this is best known to himself. Chemists, physicians, botanists, zoologists, politicians, theologians, find that their reasoning has to do with very different resemblances, resemblances of quality, and their reasoning as much needs canons of logic as the mathematician's.

Finally comes order in Place, which of course is referred to geometry, and thus he concludes that the logic of causation and the logic of mathematics include the whole subject. In his discussion of the logic of mathematics he shows much acumen and good sense, and yet his whole reasoning is vitiated by his adherence to sense and virtual denial of Space and Time. The propositions of geometry are not propositions concerning material forms, but concerning the space which matter occupies.

And in the classification of functions, we cannot allow that Mr. Mill's list of simple functions is correct. Every simple function of x, says he, can be reduced to one of the following simple forms: $x+a$, $x-a$, ax, $x \div a$, x^a, a/x, $\log. x$, and perhaps $\sin. x$, and $\sin[-1]. x$. To which of these forms can Mr. Mill reduce $d_{c.a}\, x$, $\int_a x$, $\mathcal{E}_a x$, and the conjugate of x? The fact is, that new simple functions of x are discovered on the invention of every new calculus, for which they serve as a foundation; and can no more be reduced to Mr. Mill's simple functions than those functions can be resolved into each other.

at least by approximate generalization, and from them can be deduced a science of the formation of character. Social life too can give birth to a system of science, and although its laws can be learned only by observation, they can nevertheless be so far verified as to be of great service.

In treating this part of his subject Mill uses the terms Chemical method, Abstract method, Physical method, Historical method. This shows that he saw the fundamental varieties in reasoning, which make the method of one science inapplicable to another. Yet those varieties he has not touched upon, but has merged them all in his canons for discovering causes.

In regard to this concluding part of Mr. Mill's work we have but little to say, since, as we conceive, he entirely mistakes his ground, by supposing that laws of causation are alone the object of inquiry. For it is not causes only, but resemblances and existences, which are sought in social sciences, and although Mr. Mill's remarks are very just and of great value as far as they go, we are struck here more than ever with the deficiencies of his views.

For instance, in his approbation of Comte's generalization, that the human mind is first theological, next metaphysical, finally positive, how plainly is the narrowness of his view exposed. Cannot the "theological" errors of young children and infant nations be explained by reference to the better established facts of "fallacies of generalization?" And the positive state, is it accompanied by doubts of God's existence? Is not the earlier fallacious generalization corrected, and does not the belief in one God remain as a firm, immovable induction? In whose mind, save Auguste Comte's or John Stuart Mill's, did the metaphysical, much less the positive state ever exclude the idea of God, a prime Cause of all things, visible and invisible, whose will is the source of all quality, power and motion, nay of all beings, material or spiritual, to whom all honor is due, and on whom all the affections of the heart fasten as the only good and holy One?

In taking a general view of Mr. Mill's book, the attention is most forcibly arrested by his treatment of the doctrine of causation. A cause, he says, need be considered only as "the assemblage of phenomena, which occurring, some other phenomenon invariably commences, or has its origin."

That is, the law of cause and effect is but a law of invariable and unconditional sequence, and implies nothing of power. This law he would have extend also to mental phenomena. Hence we have, even in our own actions, nothing which really implies the existence of power. We have, as Comte endeavors to show, nothing on which we can really build, except the succession of states of consciousness. Yet the successive sensations imply the existence of the outward world, and, as Mill and Comte both agree, our positive knowledge becomes that of the successive and coexistent states of the material world. Further than this they are both unwilling to go. The human mind as manifested in action and thought, and the world revealed to the senses, — this is the extent of their field. Occult qualities, powers of any kind, divine or human, efficient causes, — these are matters for the metaphysician to handle, and of the metaphysician Mill thinks almost as meanly as Comte.

But how arbitrary is this curtailment of the powers of the mind. If we believe in the existence of matter as the cause of our sensations, on what ground do we believe it? The only positive knowledge is the succession of states of consciousness. Mr. Mill smells something, he is conscious of a color which he calls yellow, of a form which he calls round, or rather of a certain diversity of light and shade, and of a feeling which he calls soft, and he says here is an orange. Why does he believe it? Why does he reject Berkeley's theory? Or even on Berkeley's theory, why does Mill proceed to eat his orange in full confidence of finding a pleasant taste, a muscular sensation of liquid passing down his throat, and a reviving of his whole frame? Why, to be sure, he trusts in his senses. If he gives up his trust in them, insanity and madness follow.

This is well enough; but let us ask him another question. When he had written his book, why did he publish it? Why was he convinced of its truth and importance? Because he had confidence in the soundness of his own mental faculties. The successive sensations, thoughts, emotions, and volitions in his mind, he was convinced, did not deceive him; he strictly *knew* that of which he was conscious. Very well; but we are conscious of power, and this consciousness does not deceive us.

Indeed on Mill's own ground, whence do we get the

idea of efficient cause? Not from the outward world, for there it does not exist. And if from the inner world, it is either from a consciousness of our own exertion of power, or from the operation of the laws of our nature. If therefore we deny the existence of efficient causes, we deny either the veracity of consciousness or the truthfulness of our nature, in either of which cases what ground is there left for any positive knowledge? To this reasoning Mill might object, that men conceived of hippogriffs and centaurs, why not of power, without making the existence necessary. But hippogriffs are *combinations*, not *creations*. Let Mill conceive of a new color, or imagine a sixth sense, and then he may say that power is non-existent.

The very laws of induction which Mill acknowledges, (we do not now refer to the canons for discovering causes, but to the higher laws of induction by which the law of causation was established), are as amply sufficient to prove the being of a personal, living God, as they are to establish the law of causation, or the axioms of geometry.

Matter unorganized is inert. This induction is one of the widest and most firmly established. The majority of the motions of organized life are produced by volitions. Volitions have the power of moving also unorganized matter. The motions, which unorganized matter takes in obedience to volitions, are generally of the character distinguished as means to an end. When they are of this character, the volition always has a motive.

Matter is inert, yet there are a thousand natural motions. Are these exceptions to the law of inertia? No; else that law would rest on an invalid induction. Then they arise from a volition. These natural motions are mostly of the character of means to an end. Then the volition has a motive.

Now we defy Mr. Mill or Auguste Comte to show any reason why these inductions do not prove the being of God just as clearly as the watch proves the watchmaker, nay, just as clearly as the living voice of Comte in his lectures would prove his existence.

We confess there is one light in which the Positive view of science is correct, namely, that we have no proof of occult qualities in matter. We can prove a living God; not one who, ages ago, appointed attraction and repulsion his viceroys, and may now for aught we know be dead.

Mr. Mill's book is on the whole, however, the best work that has appeared on the subject of Logic. Constrained, as he is, on many points by narrow prejudices, betraying, as he does, a want of minute accuracy in several branches of science, and lacking that comprehensiveness of view which is necessary for one who reviews the whole field of human reasoning, he has nevertheless unfolded the reasoning process with much strength and beauty. His style is a model of clearness and precision, though it is lamentably deficient in conciseness and energy. Although narrow in his prejudices, he deals justly and kindly with those from whom he differs.

The study of Logic, in its wide sense, as used by Mill, lies at the very foundation of all liberal education, and for this reason we rejoice to see a renewed attention to the subject in both the English Universities and our own. The business of man has been said to be that of drawing inferences. The whole conscious state of thought is a train of reasoning. From childhood to age, whether attending to the most minute affairs of daily life, or to the highest duties of the statesman, the artist, the engineer, the theologian or the philosopher, we are still reasoning, drawing inferences, and all things from the least to the greatest depend upon the correctness of our conclusions.

This consideration sets in a strong light the value of a proper cultivation of the reasoning power, and although this cultivation may be gained by mere exercise, just as any other power or art is gained by trial, it is evident that we can best train and develope the reason when we understand its laws and manner of action. Besides, there is nothing but a thorough system of logic, thoroughly learned, that can save a man from the grossest mistakes, when he attempts to reason on a subject with which he is unacquainted.

Amid the variety of subjects on which the human mind may exercise itself, there are no two in which the style of reasoning is precisely the same. But the man who has studied only one branch of science, or pursued one course of life, is apt to imagine that all reasoning is to be tested by his methods. He that has been used altogether to reasonings of a general nature, will be unwilling to submit questions even of motion to algebraical analysis. "Do you suppose," said an intelligent friend to us while we were

putting one of his theories in regard to a compound barometer into an equation, in order to show him the fallacy of his reasoning; "do you suppose the Lord has made quicksilver and oil to run according to your mathematical formulas?"

In like manner one who has been used only to mathematical reasoning is apt to deny the validity of inductions, and to believe only points which can be directly deduced from incontrovertible axioms. The anecdote of Laplace introducing the spirit of the infinitely small into the politics and governments of France, is well known. Nor are those accustomed to inductive reasoning always fitted for every branch of induction. The chemist may be wholly unfitted for geological pursuits, and the politician be unable to appreciate the labors of the botanist.

It is this inability to appreciate the reasoning of other men, which constitutes narrowness of mind. The truly great man is one who holds sympathy with all true minds, and understands all kinds of reasoning. Hence it is that the great man presents to different men different appearances, as their minds may be capable of understanding different parts of his labors. Socrates is described by Xenophon as a man of sound practical wisdom, whose philosophy rests on observation and experience. But Plato represents him rather as a man of deep reflection, whose philosophy is built upon the teachings of his own soul. Socrates was himself both. When he met the sophisms of Gorgias, and would prove to this ranting logic-chopper the reality of right, the baseness of sin, the meanness of selfishness, and expose to him the falsehood of his own philosophy and the shallowness of his thoughts, he met him on his own chosen field, and refuted him by arguments drawn from the consciousness and inward teachings of the soul. When, on the other hand, he met the atheist and the sensualist, whose lives were in the outward world, and whose souls were dead within them, he convicted them, not by metaphysic subtlety which they could not have comprehended, but by arguments drawn from that outward world which was so real to them. But a narrow-minded man, a little soul, could not have done this. Xenophon, perhaps, could not have refuted Gorgias, because Xenophon did not understand the type or style of reasoning which metaphysi-

cal questions demand. Plato, perhaps, could not have instructed Alcibiades, nor have led Aristodemus to piety, because Plato would have misunderstood and despised the reasoning by which the one justified himself in sensuality, and the other fortified himself in atheism.

Now it is an undeniable fact, that men are differently qualified for different branches of study. Each man has peculiar tastes, which if indulged will lead him to adopt some particular line of thought or conduct. It is thus, from a natural gift enabling a man to excel in some one style of reasoning, that he too often allows himself to become exclusive in the use of it, and he applies it to branches to which it is foreign. A mathematician meddles with theology or politics, and foolishly attempts to demonstrate questions of faith, or the policy of measures of Government. Or the metaphysician steps in, as Stewart, and says to the mathematician, your province is in hypotheses and diagrams, you have no right to meddle with mechanics and astronomy, for they belong to the province of things. Let the sublime height to which the mathematician has led the natural philosopher be his answer.

Shall we then blame Stewart for speaking of mechanics, and say to him, "Ne supra crepidam sutor?" By no means. But he ought not to have spoken till he first understood the logic of demonstrative reasoning. Say not, "let the theologian be a theologian, and the chemist a chemist, and the politician a politician;" for then none could enjoy another's labor, and the world would be divided into different classes of the mentally deformed. Let, rather, every man learn as much of the logic of every science and as many of its interesting features, as to make him sympathize with its enthusiasts in their joy, to fit him for receiving the fruit of their labors, to teach him not to apply to subjects connected with it an improper kind of reasoning, and to make him perceive when others introduce its reasoning into his own branch; let him learn thus much of every science, and then apply himself to the one for which he is fitted.

Now the logic which will produce this ennobling and enlarging effect on the student, must be one of a different kind from any yet published. Even Mr. Mill's, wide as is its field, is narrow in comparison with the real extent of the subject. In those six hundred octavo pages he might have

written many times as much, and to immensely greater advantage.

Mill asserts that there are five things which can be affirmed or denied, to wit, existence, sequence, coexistence, causation, and resemblance. Now if five things can be affirmed and denied, surely five things can be proved and disproved. Yet Mill's canons of induction give us merely the means of proving causation. Where are his canons for proving the other points? Even upon his own ground his logic is deficient. It should have contained canons for testing the evidence for existence, for sequence, for coexistence, and for resemblance.

But we believe that a better foundation for extending the legitimate field of logic is found in Whewell's enunciation of the fundamental ideas of each science. Let Whewell's doctrine, or so much of it as is true, be stated in the proper form, and the subject be treated in Mill's cool and common sense way, and a system of Logic will be formed that will completely cover the whole ground, will serve as a true basis of liberal education, and be of vast service in guarding men from the dangers of narrow feelings and contracted views.

Let, first, the general form of reasoning and of induction be stated, and such rules be given as are really applicable to the whole subject. Next, let reasoning be divided according to the subject matter into three great divisions, — reasoning upon space and time, reasoning upon matter, reasoning upon mind. These divisions may not be perfect, and it may be sometimes difficult to decide to which of the three you shall refer a particular subject, yet in general they are distinct, and correspond to three kinds, or types of reasoning, for which no distinct names have been invented, but which may perhaps be called the Demonstrative, the Inductive, and the Metaphysical types of Reasoning. Then under each of these heads may be subdivisions for the separate sciences. And under each science let the objects of the science, and the peculiar canons to guide the reasoner therein, be given.*

* For instance, under Space and Time come the different mathematical branches. First, we have Geometry, the science of position and magnitude in space. The fundamental ideas of this science are distance and direction. And as Mill says of sensations, that the laws of motion cannot

The objection may be raised, that such a system of Logic would be in fact an encyclopedia of human knowledge,

---

explain color, that each sense must have its own laws, so is it equally true, that the laws of reasoning on other ideas cannot explain nor assist reasoning respecting distance and direction. Mr. Mill's canons for discovering causation are here out of place.

Under this head of Geometry, then, a complete work on Logic would give the canons by which the phenomena of distance and direction are to be discovered. These canons are gained by generalizations according to the more universal rules to be contained in the first part of the book. Whether in pure Geometry any other canon is needed than, that figures capable of coincident superposition are equal, is a question which might admit of doubt.

The science of pure Time has never been fully developed. Hamilton made some essays towards it and partially developed its fundamental ideas.

We have here also Algebra, the science of Quantity; Fluxions, the science of Motion; Arithmetic, the science of Number; each having its peculiar fundamental ideas, which it is the object of the science fully to develope; each having also its peculiar canons of reasoning, derived by the more general kind of reasoning from its universal facts. It might be a question, whether the Residual Calculus, and the Imaginary, require any different canons from those of Algebra.

But we think it manifest, that neither Whately's exposition of the syllogism, nor Whewell's discussion of appropriate conceptions, nor Mill's canons for discovering causation are a sufficient exposition of the nature of mathematical reasoning, and that a logic is greatly deficient, which does not analyze that reasoning which is acknowledged by all to be the most splendid work of the human intellect. The folly of making all mathematical reasoning mere syllogism, is too great to be put forth seriously by any mathematician. The arithmetic of sines is no more included in the definition of a circle, than potassium in the definition of potash. The residual calculus of Cauchy was as new to the greatest mathematician as to a mere school-boy. The truths respecting Space and Time are as really truths, and are as really *discovered* by mathematical reasoning, as any facts of sense are truths, and discovered by sensation.

Under the Inductive type of reasoning would come the different branches of physical science. Here Mill's canons of causation, evidently out of place in the demonstrative type, will come in play. Yet they are by no means the only canons which are needed. In mechanics, it is granted, there is nothing wanted but these and demonstrative reasoning. In the simpler parts of mechanics, we need, in developing the fundamental idea of *force*, only a demonstration like that of the old geometry. But as we proceed to higher problems, especially to the motions of fluids, our reasoning changes its character and assumes more of the inductive type. Still we seek only causes; and Mill's canons joined with deductions are sufficient. But look at another physical science, chemistry. Here in developing the fundamental idea of *quality*, we seek not for causes, but for chemical likeness and chemical identity. How are these to be reached by canons for discovering a cause? Mill's canons embrace, then, only a part of chemical reasoning, for they give no aid in discovering the objects at which chemistry aims. A complete system of logic will then include under its head of chemistry canons for discovering likeness and identity, in the chemical sense of those words.

and would exceed in bulk all moderate bounds. But as to size, it might easily be comprised in as small a bulk as either Mr. Mill's or Mr. Whewell's work. And an encyclopedia it would not be. It would contain only the fundamental ideas of each science, and the fundamental canons of investigation. The facts of the science would not be introduced, the subject matter, as Whately styles it, would be left out of view, except so far as the very character of the reasoning itself depended upon it. Inductive reasoning is capable only of the vaguest and most general exposition, unless the subject matter be in some measure taken into account. Even Mill takes subject matter into consideration, for he supposes the object of the reasoning to be to find causes. Of induction in general he was forced to say but little; he introduced at once a subject matter, causation, and gave the canons for reasoning upon that. He was justified in so doing. But should he not, like Whewell, have introduced a notice of the logic on other subjects? If the

---

Again, in the study of organization there is an idea very distinct from that of cause, namely, purpose or end. Lord Bacon sneers at the investigation of purposes in organized beings, and says that the eyelashes grow not to defend the eye, but because of the nourishing moisture of the tears. Certain of the French philosophers also have endeavored to treat of physiology only under the aspect of cause and effect. Yet the attempt is futile. The question of purpose comes as irresistibly to the mind in the contemplation of organized matter, as the question of cause in the contemplation of unorganized. The main business of physiology, or at least its distinctive and peculiar business, is to discover not the causes, but the purposes of the different functions of organic life. The teeth are equally the cause of crushing food, and of the toothache, but it is solemn trifling to say they were equally designed for both; it is introducing the metaphysical, or else the mechanical type of reasoning into a subject foreign to it.

The axiom that every organ is designed for some function is as well established, as the one that every effect has a cause; and is full as worthy to be made the foundation of a set of logical canons. It has been the fundamental axiom, which has led to all the greatest improvements in zoology and botany, and it will be the guide to all the most valuable results in future. While in other sciences, such as that of chemistry or mechanics, the axiom would be out of place, and the search for a purpose there would *generally* (not always) be vain.

Let us pass now to the third type of reasoning — the Metaphysical. Here again the sub-types would be as numerous as the different sciences. One set of canons would judge of testimony of men, another would relate to the affairs of wealth, a third to government, a fourth to mental phenomena of thought, a fifth to different emotions, and so on. These again would be subdivided, and a logic given of Ethics, and of Æsthetics, of Psychology, of Law, of Political Economy, of Legislation. Perhaps, with the permission of Messrs. Mill and Comte, we might even have a logic of Theology.

remarks already made (including those contained in the note) do not produce conviction on this subject, let us examine Mr. Mill's own example. The blackness of all crows does not make it very improbable that there should be a white crow, but the form of man makes it impossible that we should find men with their heads below their shoulders. Mill asks why, and answers that it is because the colors of animals are more variable than their forms. We deny that this is the reason, and even if it were, how is this generalization connected with causation? With another and higher induction it *is* connected, and it is this that gives value to the one generalization, and not to the other. We see the *purpose* why the head is on the shoulders, but we do not see the *purpose* of the color of a crow. Hence we are certain that all men's heads are on their shoulders, although we do not see the "cause" of it; and hence also we are not certain that all crows are black, and might not be, even if we knew the cause of their blackness. If therefore Mill introduced the subject matter, cause, he should also, even to explain his own examples, have introduced the subject matter, purpose or design.

But again, in regard to the encyclopedic character of such a treatise on logic, Mr. Whewell in his Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences has mentioned each branch of science separately, and yet has not destroyed the unity of his work.

We must likewise remember that, formidable as the list of sciences appears, the reasoning would be marked out in three general heads, and some of the sciences would require very few separate remarks, the reasoning conforming closely to the general type of that department.

If such views of logic be not adopted and made the regulators of the thoughts of men, we see little hope of an intellectual regeneration of the world. Men will still wrangle about matters above their comprehension, and leave unnoticed the lessons which the Creator would teach them. We shall still have sensationalists, making the present world their God, scorning the arguments of faith and piety, and by their rejection of religion making themselves and others outcast orphans in the world. We shall still have transcendental religionists, puffing themselves with vain pride, leading silly women captive, and sillier men, and treating

as beneath their transcendent genius such vulgar things as God's stars, "made to make dirt cheap," or God's flowers, or God's beasts and living creatures, or the still more vulgar things that pertain to outward comfort, such as machinery, steamships, and rail-roads. We shall still have even Christians splitting on the rock of false logic, each one carrying to the Scriptures his own type of reasoning, one attempting to demonstrate a science of sanctity, another to make inductions from a collection of texts, a third treating it all as poetry, and the voice of the few who have a true logic of hermeneutics drowned in the jarring war of sectarists, amid whose contentions the Church lies torn and bleeding.

But let thinking men enlarge their views of logic, let them establish as firm a logical canon for other points as has been done for syllogism and induction of causes, let the distinctive marks of the type of reasoning proper for each science be clearly pointed out, and the happiest results cannot fail to follow. Then shall each branch of philosophy and of science be carried to the highest point of perfection by men who will also sympathize with the labors and joys of others, and the race as a whole go forward in diversity, yet harmony, towards the attainment of their high objects, — the possession of every useful and beautiful art, and the knowledge of all truth.

When we remember how mighty has been the change wrought within two centuries, and how much of it is due to the writings of Bacon and Locke; when we see, too, how within fifty years the state of the world has been changing with ever accelerating speed; we can hardly look forward with too lively a hope for the still more splendid fruits, which will come from a remodelling of the sciences and a more clear understanding of the reasoning powers, as a basis for a more judicious training of the intellect. If we extend our view to the ultimate attainments of our race, the eye is dazzled by the blaze of light, and the spirit is overwhelmed by the vastness, the mystery and grandeur of the scene. T. H.

Art. V. — THE PILGRIMS AT LEYDEN.*

The modest little pamphlet, the title of which is given below, originally published in the volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society recently issued, (Vol. IX. Third Series,) contains the solution of a question closely connected with the early history of New England, which, though perfectly simple in itself, has been strangely distorted by the party feelings of some historians and the negligence of others. In profiting by his visit to Holland, in order to institute a careful examination into the only sources from which the truth could be drawn, Mr. Sumner has rendered a service to our history, the full value of which can be estimated by those alone, who have been accustomed to face the formidable array of time-worn documents, which fill the archives and libraries of Europe. A succinct analysis of his essay will be the best confirmation of our assertion.

What was the condition of the Pilgrims during their sojourn in Holland? Was it from a refuge endeared by hospitality and sweetened by the interchange of kindly sympathies and tokens of respect, that they sought for conscience' sake the wilds of New England? Or was it an escape from sufferings, of which they knew by long experience the full extent and bearing, to a land the dangers of which were but imperfectly known, and however great, were accounted as nothing in comparison with the religious freedom, for which they had already learned to make their homes in a strange land? It would be vain to look to general historians for a satisfactory answer to this question. Robertson, Burke, and others of less note, represent them as living in obscurity and neglect, and their statements have been adopted on our own side of the Atlantic by Marshall. Others, relying upon the authority of Prince and Morton, have described their position in Holland as one of union among themselves and harmony with their neighbors, some even going so far as to make public protestation of their gratitude to the Dutch for the favors

* *Memoirs of the Pilgrims at Leyden.* By George Sumner, Foreign Member of the Geographical Society of Berlin, etc. etc. Cambridge. 1846. 8vo. pp. 33.

which they showered down upon our ancestors. It is only by a reference to unbiassed contemporary writers and positive documents, that the question can be decided.

Of the first class, and first in the class to which it belongs, is the Journal of Governor Bradford; and certainly the picture that he draws of things which his own eyes beheld, is far from agreeing with the highly colored description of the prosperity of the Pilgrims in Holland, which it has more than once been appealed to as confirming. For he paints them as men worn down by toil, dejected by sorrow, already yielding to the first benumbing touches of age, which strike the deeper, inasmuch as they see their children too sinking under the weight of their daily hardships and growing old before their time. Their consciences are free, it is true, and untainted, and they "enjoy spiritual comfort together in the ways of God;" but was it for themselves alone that they had sought out the true path with fasting and prayer, and forsaken country and home, that they might walk in it unrestrained? Or did they, like all men whom high motives actuate, feel themselves impelled by a sacred duty to extend to others, and especially to those who had suffered in the same cause, the freedom and advantages which they had won? Bradford himself has answered us, and neither Prince nor Morton, who arbitrarily interpolate and mutilate his pages, can be put for a moment in competition with this testimony of an eye-witness. "And first, they found and saw by experience the hardness of the place and country to be such as few in comparison would come to them, and fewer that would bide it out and continue with them. * * * Yea, some preferred and chose prisons in England rather than this liberty in Holland with these afflictions." *

Had Mr. Sumner contented himself with calling our attention to these passages in their original purity, he would have deserved our warmest thanks for the restoration of an important fact. But he is far from having stopped here, for, with a patience and assiduity which cannot be appreciated too highly, he has drawn from the municipal archives of Leyden and the records of her churches the fullest confirmation of Bradford's accuracy. There is hardly one

* Bradford, ap. Sumner, pp. 6, 7.

of the questions so ably discussed in his text and appendix, which must not have cost him days of laborious research.

And first he has shown, that no church was ever granted the Pilgrims to worship in at Leyden, — thus overturning the chief argument of those who claimed for our ancestors a state of prosperity and respectful consideration, in a land where, according to Bradford, "they lived but as men in exile and in a poor condition." The first to advance this argument was Prince, who gives no other authority than the traditions of Leyden, traditions which had so completely worn away when Mr. Sumner visited that city, that many of the men most learned in such subjects, and professionally interested in them, had no knowledge of the residence of such a sect among their industrious ancestors. How then did the tradition arise, for no one would wish to attribute it to Prince as a wilful fabrication? The error was a very natural one. In 1609 there was founded at Leyden an English Presbyterian church, which has been constantly confounded with the congregation of Brownists or Separatists, to which our ancestors belonged. This church enjoyed the protection of Government, and in a valuable note Mr. Sumner has given a sketch of its history, with a list of its pastors during the period of the Pilgrims' sojourn at Leyden, and several important extracts from the "Acts of the Reformed Church" in that city, which throw great light upon the character of that portion of the English Protestants, who actually did enjoy the privileges which have been claimed for a small and neglected band of their countrymen.

Where then did the Pilgrims worship, and where did Robinson preach? In the house of their pastor, under his own roof. "Non vien permesso però l' esercitio publico nelle città se non a' Calvinisti, come ho accennato di sopra; nè si consente, che s' insegni altra dottrina publicamente nelle scuole, che quella della lor setta. A tutte l' altre è permesso l' esercitio nelle case private." "The public exercises of religion are not permitted in the cities to any sect but the Calvinists; neither is it allowed that any other doctrines than theirs shall be taught publicly in the schools. The exercises of all others are permitted in private houses."* And although this statement refers chiefly

* Bentivoglio ap. Sumner, p. 13.

to the Dutch, it affords a highly probable and natural answer to our question.

'But Robinson, their pastor, was held in the highest estimation, bore a distinguished part in the public discussions with Episcopius, and was followed to the grave by "the University and ministers of the city."' Of the public discussions there are no traces in the University records: yet, as they were of daily occurrence, this circumstance cannot be looked upon as decisive; and Mr. Sumner's conjecture that Robinson's tardy admission to the honors of the University,—a fact which he has been the first to bring to light,—was owing to the part which he had taken on some of these occasions, is highly ingenious and probable. But however this may be, it is certain that it was not till after a six or seven years' residence that he was admitted to this privilege, which was very freely extended to all strangers of any eminence; and even then was required to pay an admission fee, while the pastor of the recognized English church was admitted at once and without any such requisition, — a strong presumptive proof of the different degrees of estimation in which they were held.

The conclusions drawn from the attentions bestowed on his grave repose upon a still weaker foundation. Winslow, the only contemporary author by whom this circumstance is recorded, writes not from Leyden, but from Plymouth, not in a letter, or a journal, or even a history, but in a tract expressly drawn up in defence of the Plymouth Colony against the accusations of Gorton and others of their opponents, whom posterity has learned to judge less harshly than their contemporaries. White, who writes from Leyden the very month after Robinson's death, says nothing of these honors, nor is there any mention of them in the other letters preserved in Bradford's letter-book.*

Still more. The plague was raging in all its fury at the time of Robinson's death, and the burial-registers of Leyden, which Mr. Sumner has examined with his wonted care, bear melancholy testimony to the fearful ravages

* Mass. Hist. Coll. quoted by Sumner. The substance of this letter is given also by Prince, (p. 159;) but without any mention of the plague, and in a form, which, as he pretends to use the precise words of the writer, is hardly admissible, though not uncommon.

which it made. Robinson did not die of the plague, it is true, but it is not less true, that during the prevalence of this scourge all public funerals were suspended and the ringing of bells even forbidden. Could he have formed an exception?

But a still more convincing argument is drawn from the fact that he was buried in a temporary grave — a little pit where four coffins were laid in together — hired for a term which at the utmost did not exceed seven years, and for the trifling sum of nine florins, or three dollars and sixty cents, the price paid by day-laborers and men of the lowest condition. Would such have been the burial-place of one honored by the magistrates and the University, and followed by them in solemn procession to his grave? Or was it not rather like the spot, around which a few care-worn men, whom their common sufferings unite, meet to pay their last tribute to one whom they fain would honor with something more than tears, and whom, deeply as they love him, they yet must envy, for he has escaped before them from the pains and trials which they had long borne together?

It will be seen that Mr. Sumner's arguments are based upon two incontrovertible canons of historical criticism. 1. That the silence of contemporary historians — themselves actors in the scenes which they describe — concerning any important fact, is a strong presumptive proof against it. 2. That the mention of any favorable fact or circumstance by a professed apologist of the party or person to which or whom it relates, cannot be considered as possessing any authority unless it be supported by positive documents.

To this reasoning he has brought an ample array of documentary evidence, and has developed his views with a degree of skill and a logical vigor, which leave us at a loss whether more to admire the extent and accuracy of his researches or the force and lucidness of his reasoning.

But after all, *cui bono?* Why so many pages for the correction of an error, which, make as much of it as we may, has no apparent general bearing? The question at the utmost was a very simple one, and now that it is solved, looks exceedingly like the problem of the egg when once made to stand by itself. It was but to give contemporary statements their due weight, follow the genuine

text of Bradford, and pay no attention to compilations. But it is precisely here that the difficulty lies, and it is this patience in going back to original sources, and this skill in applying the sound principles of criticism to the discussion of remote events, that forms one of the most striking features in the progress of historical composition. Daily experience shows how intimate a relation exists between events which have no apparent connexion; through what singular combinations one thing is brought about by another; and the discovery of a single fact, of no great importance in itself, made the stepping-stone to others of deep and universal interest. We will suppose, then, for a moment that the subject of this dissertation is one of little importance, difficult as it is to apply this term to any thing connected with our forefathers, and that the fact in itself is but a trifling acquisition to our history. But can we go back with our original confidence to the "careful Prince," who adopts without inquiry a floating tradition and makes it the basis of positive conclusions? Or to Morton, who, omitting the complimentary word of a sentence, substitutes in its stead an entirely new clause at open variance with the statement of his author? Or to the "venerable Cotton Mather," who sometimes writes from insufficient authorities, and often from none at all?

"Much error," says Bancroft in his dignified and elegant preface, "had become incorporated with American history, * * * The early history was often written with a carelessness which seized on rumors and vague recollections as sufficient authority for an assertion which satisfied prejudice by wanton perversions, and which, where materials were not at hand, substituted the inferences of the writer for authenticated facts. These early books have ever since been cited as authorities, and the errors, sometimes repeated even by considerate writers, whose distrust was not excited, have almost acquired a prescriptive right to a place in the annals of America."

Did our limits permit us, we should wish to follow out this idea, and illustrate it by a detailed examination of some passages in our early history, But Mr. Sumner's dissertation contains the best proof of its justness. Would that his example might be followed by the members of our Historical Societies. What might they not accomplish, if

they would but direct their combined exertions to the republication of the original writers from authentic manuscripts and editions, and the illustration, by a series of careful dissertations, of the principal questions of our history! What too might not our travellers do, if each would, like Mr. Sumner, bring his tribute to the common cause, and, like him, renounce for a while the attractions of the saloon, for dusty archives! For this little pamphlet is a traveller's tribute, and in closing our notice of it we will venture to suggest, that one who has displayed so much learning and research and critical skill, in the investigation of a question which can have been of only incidental interest, must have gathered a harvest of uncommon value in those departments, the study of which has formed more especially the object of his travels. G. W. G.

ART. VI. — PERFECTIONISM. — UPHAM'S LIFE OF FAITH.*

WE propose to offer a few remarks upon Professor Upham's new work, "The Life of Faith." But, it may not be amiss to present, by way of introduction, a brief sketch of the rise and character of the peculiar religious views, in which this work originated. When, some years since, the lines of separation were drawn between the self-styled Orthodox and the Unitarian portions of the community, one of the charges brought against the Unitarians was, that they expected to be saved by their own merits, by their

---

* 1. *The Life of Faith, in three Parts; embracing some of the Scriptural Principles or Doctrines of Faith, the Power or Effects of Faith in the Regulation of Man's Inward Nature, and the Relation of Faith to the Divine Guidance.* By THOMAS C. UPHAM. Boston: Wait, Pierce & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 480.

2. *Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection, with other kindred subjects, illustrated and confirmed in a series of Discourses designed to throw light on the way of Holiness.* By Rev. ASA MAHAN, President of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute. Seventh edition. Boston: Waite, Peirce & Co. 1844. 18mo. pp. 193.

3. *Holiness of Christians in the Present Life.* By Rev. HENRY COWLES, Professor in Oberlin Theol. Seminary. Oberlin. 1840. 18mo. pp. 124.

4. *The Oberlin Quarterly Review.* Edited by Rev. ASA MAHAN, and Professor WILLIAM COCHRAN. Nos. 1–3. Oberlin (Ohio.) 1845–6. 8vo.

own good works. In connection with this charge, it was alleged that the preaching of the Unitarian clergy was mere moral preaching, very well as far as it went, but entirely destitute of the doctrines of grace, the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, and of all that vitality and converting or sanctifying power which can be derived from no other source. It was true that the Unitarian clergy did urge the importance of a pure and rigid morality. And, as the tendency of all separations is to drive the separating parties to opposite extremes, perhaps they did not, at that time, dwell sufficiently upon the necessity of a heart right with God, as the source of all true Christian morality. But the clergy of the opposite, or self-styled Orthodox, party went to the opposite extreme, and dwelt almost exclusively upon the importance of a correct belief, as the ground of acceptance with God. They warned the community against trusting to their own merits, and denounced good works as no better than "filthy rags." Whatever may have been the wish or the purpose of those who urged these views upon the attention of the community, the effect of their preaching was to magnify, in the estimation of their hearers, the importance of correctness in belief, or in other words, as the subject was generally understood, of correctness in speculative opinions, and to lessen in their minds the value of a pure and holy life. It produced great zeal for the spread of their peculiar dogmas, accompanied by comparative indifference in regard to high moral worth. This was seen and lamented by many pious and devout persons of the different Orthodox denominations.

This state of feeling could not continue long, without producing a reaction. For the human heart is so constituted, that it will not long remain satisfied with mere speculative theology, with a religion confined to the head, leaving the affections cold and lifeless. It will be true to its own spiritual longings and tendencies. Consequently there soon sprang up among the Orthodox Congregationalists and Presbyterians a class of religionists, who urged the importance of a higher standard of practical holiness than was then prevalent, and who contended that it was possible for men, through God's grace assisting them, to attain even in this world a state of entire consecration both of heart and life to the service of God. Rev. Asa Mahan,

President of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute, became a prominent advocate of these views. Perhaps it may not be uninteresting to our readers, to see President Mahan's account of the circumstances which led to his change of opinions. And we are the more inclined to give it, as it serves to confirm the views we have already advanced, in regard to the origin of this peculiar manifestation. After speaking of his conversion, and of his religious feelings at the commencement of the Christian course, he proceeds to say: —

"In this state, I commenced my studies as a student in college. Here I fell, and fell by not aiming singly at the 'prize of the high calling;' but at the prize of college honors. I subsequently entered a theological seminary, with the hope of there finding myself in such an atmosphere, that my first love would be revived. In this expectation, I grieve to say, I was sadly disappointed. I found the piety of my brethren apparently as low as my own. I here say it, with sorrow of heart, that my mind does not recur to a single individual connected with the 'school of the prophets,' when I was there, who appeared to me to enjoy daily communion and peace with God. After completing my course under such circumstances, I entered the ministry, proud of my intellectual attainments, and armed, as I supposed, at every point with the weapons of theological warfare, but with the soul of piety chilled and expiring within me. Blessed be God, the remembrance of what I had been remained, and constantly aroused me to a consciousness of what I was. I looked into myself, and over the church, and was shocked at what I felt and what I saw. Two facts in the aspect of the church and the ministry struck my mind with gloomy interest. Scarcely an individual, within the reach of my knowledge, seemed to know the Gospel as a *sanctifying* or *peace-giving* Gospel. In illustration of this remark, let me state a fact which I met with in the year 1831 or 1832. I then met a company of my ministerial brethren, who had come together in one of the most favored portions of the country. They sat down together, and gave to each other an undisguised disclosure of the state of their hearts; and they all, with one exception, — and the experience of that individual I did not hear, — acknowledged that they had not daily communion and peace with God. Over these facts they wept, but neither knew how to direct the others out of the thick and impenetrable gloom which covered them; and I was in the same ignorance as my brethren. I state these facts as a fair example of the state of the churches, and of the ministry, as far as my observation has extended; and that has been very extensive." — pp. 182 – 184.

As an additional witness to the same point, we quote from a small work on Holiness, by Professor Cowles, of the Oberlin Institute, who sympathizes with President Mahan in his views upon this subject. Professor Cowles lays it down as one of his starting-points, that "the standard of piety, throughout the American Church," (meaning the Orthodox portion of it,) "is extremely low, and that the spirit of the world has deeply pervaded and exceedingly engrossed the church." And this is said, not in the tone in which many Orthodox writers and journals are in the practice of lamenting the want of revivals and the absence of the Holy Spirit. For Professor Cowles assigns the prevalence of revivals as one of the causes of the state of things of which he is speaking. He says: —

"The present century has been gloriously distinguished as one of benevolent and revival *action*. The dazzling splendor of these movements and the bustling scenes of this labor have drawn many Christians away from deep communion with their own hearts, and with the Spirit of God. In this respect none can doubt that piety has assumed a new type since the days of our fathers. There is more of external action and doing, — but far less of heart-watchfulness, the subduing of sin, and holy communion with the Spirit. Is it strange that under such influences, the standard of holiness should be depressed? The bustle of this action is now passing by. In respect to revivals, at least, we have reason to fear a reaction, the result of excited and spasmodic effort, which springs not chiefly from pure devotion and divine influence. Plainly, there is no remedy but for the church to come back to the first elements of piety. She must return to God and holy communion. The standard of piety must be raised. What can the church do for the conversion of the world, for her own existence even, without personal holiness, *much, deep, pure, personal holiness?*" — p. 3.

These extracts from President Mahan and Professor Cowles serve to confirm the views we have already advanced in regard to the spiritual condition of the Orthodox portion of the American Church, and of the tendency of this state of things to produce precisely the manifestation of which they, together with some others, have become the exponents. We are aware that it may be said, that these men, differing from the great body of Christians of whom they are speaking, feel bound to make out a case; and that their testimony is not, on that account, worthy of implicit confidence. But we remember that in a review from an Ortho-

dox source, intended to check the spread of President Mahan's doctrines, it was admitted, that while the Orthodox clergy, generally, held to the importance of a holy life, as fully as Dr. Mahan himself, yet, from the peculiar aspects of the times and the peculiar state of the controversies, they had not dwelt upon this point, and urged it home upon the attention of their hearers, as much as would perhaps have been desirable.

At length the state of things, of which we have spoken, was followed by its natural consequences. Dr. Mahan and others, aroused by the want of true spiritual life everywhere around them, came forward with the doctrine, that men ought, and that, through God's grace assisting them, they could with proper effort attain to perfection of Christian character, in other words, to a life of holiness on earth. From the use of the term, *perfection*, this class of Christians are called *Perfectionists*. But they are to be carefully distinguished from another class bearing the same name, sometimes called, by way of distinction, "Antinomian Perfectionists." The application of the term Perfectionist to Dr. Mahan and those who sympathize with him in sentiment, has excited great prejudice against them, not only among the Orthodox churches, but in the community generally. It may not be without its use, therefore, to point out somewhat distinctly the peculiar views of this class of Christians, and to shew wherein they differ from the "Antinomian Perfectionists."

What then do this class of Christians mean by perfection in holiness? Dr. Mahan, in answering this question, says: —

"I would remark, that perfection in holiness implies a full and perfect discharge of our entire duty, of all existing obligations in respect to God and all other beings. It is perfect obedience to the moral law. It is 'loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our strength, and our neighbor as ourselves.' * * * In the Christian, perfection in holiness implies the consecration of his whole being to Christ, — the subjection of all his powers and susceptibilities to the control of one principle — 'faith on the Son of God.' * * * Were the Christian in that state in which he should 'eat and drink, and do all that he does for the glory of God,' — in which his eye should be perfectly single to this one object; or in which the action of all his powers should be controlled by faith, which works by love, he would then, I suppose, have attained to a state

of entire sanctification, — his character would be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." — pp. 7, 8.

Still further, and more particularly, the same author says:—

"It will readily be perceived, that perfect holiness, as above described, does not imply *perfect wisdom*, the exclusive attribute of God. The Scriptures, speaking of the human nature of Christ, affirm, that 'he increased in wisdom.' This surely does not imply that his holiness was less perfect at one time than at another. So of the Christian. His holiness may be perfect in *kind*, but *finite* in *degree*, and in this sense imperfect; because his wisdom and knowledge are limited, and in this sense imperfect. Holiness, in a creature, may also be perfect, and yet progressive — progressive, not in its nature, but in degree. To be perfect, it must be progressive in the sense last mentioned, if the powers of the subject are progressive. He is perfect in holiness, whose love at each successive moment corresponds with the extent of his powers. 'If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.' Hence I remark, that perfection in holiness does not imply, that we now love God with all the strength and intensity with which redeemed spirits in heaven love him. The depth and intensity of our love depend, under all circumstances, upon the vigor and reach of our powers, and the extent and distinctness of our vision of divine truth." — pp. 8, 9.

"That we be in a perfectly sanctified state in regard to our wills, implies, that * * * every choice, every preference, and every volition be controlled by a filial regard to the divine requisitions. * * * That we 'be preserved blameless' in regard to our intellect, does not imply that we never think of what is evil. If this were so, Christ was not blameless, because he thought of the temptations of Satan. Nor could the Christian repel what is evil, as he is required to do. To repel evil, the evil itself must be before the mind, as an object of thought. To be blameless in respect to the action of our intellectual powers, does imply, 1. that every thought of evil be instantly suppressed and repelled; 2. that they be constantly employed on the inquiry, what is truth and the will of God, and by what means we may best meet the elements of the great law of love; 3. that they be employed in the perpetual contemplation of 'whatsoever things are true,' etc. That our feelings and mental susceptibilities be preserved blameless, does not imply, that they are, at all times and circumstances, in the same intensity of excitement, or in the same identical state. This the powers and laws of our being forbid. * * * That our feelings and mental susceptibilities be in a blameless state, does imply, 1. that they be held in perfect and perpetual subjection to the will of God; 2. that they be in perfect and

perpetual harmony with the truth and will of God as apprehended by the intellect. * * * That our bodies be preserved blameless, does not, of course, imply that they are free from fatigue, disease, or death. Nor does it imply that no desire be excited through our physical propensities, which, under existing circumstances, it would be unlawful to indulge. * * * That we be preserved in a sanctified and blameless state in respect to our bodies, does imply, 1. that we endeavor to acquaint ourselves with all the laws of our physical constitution; 2. that in regard to food, drink, and dress, and in regard to the indulgence of all our appetites and physical propensities, there be a sacred and undeviating conformity to these laws; 3. that every unlawful desire be instantly suppressed, and that all our propensities be held in perfect subjection to the will of God; 4. that our bodies, with all our physical powers and propensities, be 'presented to God as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable,' to be employed in his service. Such is Christian perfection. It is the consecration of the whole being to Christ, and the perpetual employment of all our powers in his service. It is the perfect assimilation of our entire character to that of Christ, having at all times, and under all circumstances, 'the same mind that was also in Christ Jesus.'" — pp. 10 – 13.

Perfection in holiness, then, according to this class of Christians, if we understand them aright, is based upon undoubting faith, and perfect love; and has its seat in the voluntary purposes of the life. It consists in the entireness of the consecration of the heart, the completeness of the devotion of purpose to the service of God, and the good of man. There is no cherished love of sin, no willing consent to it, no voluntary indulgence in it, believing it to be sin. And yet, in connection with this entireness of consecration, a man may, through ignorance, pursue wrong courses of conduct, not knowing, at the time, that they are wrong. But he will turn from them, as soon as his mind is enlightened in regard to their true character. And so too, he may be overpowered by some sudden impulse of appetite, passion or propensity, excited by powerful temptations from without. But as soon as he recovers himself, he will turn from his unholy indulgence, with much self-loathing, in the exercise of true godly sorrow, of sincere and heartfelt repentance. His devotion of purpose will be seen, in his conscientious endeavor to perform aright, in a Christian manner, and under the influence of Christian motives and feelings, all the various duties growing out of his circum-

stances, conditions and relations in life. Under the influence of this purpose, he will regard the moral precepts of the Gospel as the standard, to which he will seek to have all his feelings, wishes and actions conform. And he will study the Bible, as he would any other book, to ascertain its instructions. In other words, he will conscientiously and perseveringly, without halting in his course or wavering in his purpose, seek to lead a Christ-like life, in all its entire consecration to the will of the Father, and in all its self-sacrificing devotion to the good of man; to have "Christ formed within him," to know, by happy experience, the "Christ of consciousness." In intimate connection with this earnest endeavor, there will be a consciousness of liability to error and sin, and a deep sense of the need of spiritual assistance from above, leading the individual to God in frequent prayer and holy communion.

We have alluded to another class of religionists, bearing the same name with that we have been noticing, but who are sometimes called, by way of distinction, "Antinomian Perfectionists." As there seems to be a wide difference of opinion between the two classes, it is important to show, in this connection, wherein they differ. This we shall do in the words of President Mahan. He says: —

"This doctrine," (the doctrine of holiness of which he is treating) "it is said, is, or in its legitimate tendencies leads to, *Perfectionism*. If any individual will point out any thing intrinsic, in the doctrine here maintained, at all allied to *that* error, I, for one, will be among the first to abandon the position which I am now endeavoring to sustain. Perfectionism, technically so called, is, in my judgment, in the native and necessary tendencies of its principles, worse than the worst form of infidelity. The doctrine of holiness, in all its essential features and elements, stands in direct opposition to Perfectionism. It has absolutely nothing in common with it, but a few terms derived from the Bible. 1. Perfectionism, for example, in its fundamental principles, is the abrogation of all law. The doctrine of holiness, is perfect obedience to the precepts of the law. It is the 'righteousness of the law fulfilled in us.' 2. In abrogating the moral law, as a rule of duty, Perfectionism abrogates all obligation of every kind, and to all beings. The doctrine of holiness, contemplates the Christian as a 'debtor to all men,' to the full extent of his capacities, and consists in a perfect discharge of all these obligations — of every obligation to God and man. 3. Perfectionism is a 'rest' which suspends all effort and prayer

even, for the salvation of the world. The doctrine of holiness, consists in such a sympathy with the love of Christ, as constrains the subject to consecrate his entire being to the glory of Christ, in the salvation of men. 4. Perfectionism substitutes the direct teaching of the Spirit, falsely called, in the place of the 'word.' This expects such teachings only in the diligent study of the word, and tries every doctrine by the 'law and the testimony,' — 'the law and the testimony,' expounded in conformity with the legitimate laws of interpretation. 5. Perfectionism surrenders up the soul to blind impulse, assuming, that every existing desire or impulse is caused by the direct agency of the Spirit, and therefore to be gratified. The doctrine of holiness, consists in the subjection of all our powers and propensities to the revealed will of God. 6. Perfectionism abrogates the Sabbath, and all the ordinances of the Gospel, and, in its legitimate tendencies, even marriage itself. The doctrine of holiness, is a state of perfect moral purity, induced and perpetuated by a careful observance of all these ordinances, together with subjection to other influences of the Gospel, received by faith. 7. Perfectionism renders, in its fundamental principles, all perfection an impossibility. If, as this system maintains, the Christian is freed from all obligation, is bound by no law, — in short, if there is no standard with which to compare his actions, (and there is none,) if the moral law, as a rule of action, is abrogated, — moral perfection can no more be predicated of the Christian, than of the horse, the ox, or the ass. The doctrine of holiness, on the other hand, contemplates the moral law as the only rule and standard of the moral conduct, and consists in perfect conformity to the precepts of this law. 8. Perfectionism, in short, in its essential elements, is the perfection of licentiousness. The doctrine of holiness, is the perfect and perpetual harmony of the soul with 'whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, and, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise,' with these things also. What agreement then has the doctrine of holiness with Perfectionism?" — pp. 70 – 72.

We have thus presented a sketch of the origin and character of the peculiar religious views of the Oberlin Perfectionists. These views are gradually extending in the community. Many, of different Communions, are either embracing them in full, or allowing their opinions to be very much modified by their influence. They have now, devoted to their defence and spread, the Oberlin Evangelist, a paper, published every alternate week; and the Oberlin Quarterly Review, edited by President Mahan and Professor Cochran. "This Review is designed," say its

Editors, "to sustain a pure Literature, a correct Theology, a practical Morality and a spiritual Religion." We have felt that these peculiar views, — embraced, as they are, by men of piety and talents, — already sufficiently extended to encourage the publication of a Quarterly devoted principally to their defence and further extension, destined, as we believe, to effect an important and beneficial modification of the rigid features of Calvinism, and adapted, at the same time, to infuse a greater degree of spiritual life into the more rational and practical faith of Unitarianism, when brought in contact with it, — demanded a notice and a record on their own account. And we have also thought that this sketch was needed, to prepare the way for a better appreciation of Professor Upham's "Life of Faith," which we suppose originated in the views we have noticed.

Professor Upham has for some time sympathized, to a greater or less extent, with these views. Some years since he published a series of articles in the "Guide to Perfection," which were afterwards republished, with additions, in a volume entitled "Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life." This was not a controversial, but a practical work, devoted, not to the defence, but to the explanation and application of his peculiar views. The peculiar structure of Professor Upham's mind, the influence of his previous investigations and labors in the department of mental philosophy, and, above all, his humble and truly devout religious spirit, all serve to lead him to analysis and application, rather than to argument and controversy. And yet, in analyzing the general philosophical principles of the "hidden life," he does more, perhaps, than he could have done in any other way, to establish and confirm his peculiar views. The principal question at issue between Professor Upham and those with whom he sympathizes in sentiment on the one side, and the great body of Orthodox Christians on the other, relates to the possibility of attaining to perfection in holiness in this life. Professor Upham enters into no controversy upon this subject. But, in his analysis of the philosophical character of the religious life, he discovers and states two distinct principles, which seem to establish his own views. They are these, — "that we can never feel under moral obligation to do a thing, which we believe impossible to be done; and that no person can put

forth a volition to do a thing, which at the same time he believes impossible to be done." If then, as the great body of Orthodox Christians contend, it is impossible for men to attain to perfection in holiness in this life, it will follow, if these principles are correct, that no one can feel himself morally bound to strive after that attainment, and that no one will put forth a volition to secure it. The simple statement of these general principles of the philosophy of the mind shows, at once, the glaring inconsistency of those, who in one breath exhort men to strive for perfection in holiness, and in the next teach them that it is impossible to attain it. With Professor Upham's work on the "Interior Life" we became acquainted soon after its publication. We were soon deeply interested in it, and we have derived much spiritual instruction from the frequent perusal of it. We have kept it upon our table, as a manual of practical reading. We have freely lent it to our friends, and circulated it among the people of our charge. Without entering into an analysis of its contents, and while stating distinctly that there are expressions and views contained in it from which we differ, we would freely aver, that its influence both upon ourselves and upon those to whom we have lent it, if we may credit their testimony, has been highly favorable. While it has not diminished zeal in outward efforts for the promotion of the moral improvement of man and the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom on the earth, it has awakened a deeper sense of the importance of ever keeping the inner state of the soul pure before God, and ever cherishing a spirit of acquiescence in the will of God in regard to the result of our exertions.

Professor Upham has now followed out, in his "Life of Faith," some of the trains of thought, upon which he entered in his former work. And the latter is, to use the words of the author, "to some extent, kindred, in its nature, with the 'Interior Life.'" There is nothing of a controversial character in either. The object of both is to promote practical godliness. One great difficulty with most writers on Faith is, that they have treated of religious faith as something so different from the ordinary operations of natural faith, that they have involved the subject in an almost impenetrable mystery. Professor Upham had been led, by his previous investigations, to an acquaintance with

faith as an element of mental philosophy. He avails himself of this acquaintance, to illustrate Christian faith by a comparison of it with natural faith, shewing wherein they are the same, in character, operation and influence, and pointing out wherein they differ. In this way, he has cleared the subject of many of its difficulties, and of most of its mystery, and has rendered it intelligible to all who will reflect upon it. He has not only analyzed the nature of Christian faith, but has pointed out its relations to the various elements of the spiritual life, and its bearings upon the various parts of the Christian character. And this he has done, we think, in a clear and happy manner; while the whole book is so written, as to awaken a devout and religious state of the feelings in the reader. And this we regard as no slight recommendation. It is too often the case, that writers upon these difficult and abstruse subjects so conduct their inquiries, and so word their statements, as to leave their readers in a speculative frame of mind, a state somewhat hostile to heartfelt devotion and the spiritual life of the soul. Such is not the case with Professor Upham. No one can rise from the perusal of either of the two works we have noticed, how much soever he may differ from some of the views advanced, without finding himself in a purer and more religious frame of soul. This peculiarity arises from the spirit of the writer, which is a devotional and practical spirit, and also, in part, from the stand-point he occupies in viewing the subject. Professor Upham is viewing the subject, not in its relation to those who differ from him in speculation, but in its relation to the spiritual life and Christian character. He is seeking, not to convince or vanquish an opponent, but to promote true spirituality of the affections, and the control of Christian faith and religious principle over all the conduct, first in himself, as he writes, and afterwards in the readers who may peruse what he has written. And this object his work is well adapted to accomplish, not by means of direct exhortation or labored argument to that effect, but simply because the spirit and feelings of the writer are so diffused through the work, as to awaken, by the power of sympathy, the corresponding spirit and feelings in the reader. Professor Upham has imbibed, and sheds through his writings, something of the spirit of the mystics, of Fenelon, Madame

Guyon and others. But it is mysticism in the mind of a clear-headed, analytical investigator of mental philosophy. It does not lead him to write in the manner of the mystics; it only gives to his philosophical analysis and statements a spiritual tone and a holy unction. If he has kept company with the mystics, it has not resulted in his becoming himself one of them, but has enabled him to bring from his intercourse with them that which is truly valuable in itself, and which, when incorporated with abstract speculation, serves to make it more truly practical in its character, and more highly spiritual in its influence.

There are two particulars, in regard to which we anticipate great good to the Christian community from these works of Professor Upham. It is well known, that in many of the Orthodox denominations great account is made of religious emotions, of striking and vivid religious experiences. Especially is this the case in seasons of revival, as they are technically called. It seems to be expected that men, in becoming truly religious, must pass through a season of deep anguish of soul, and be driven almost to spiritual despair, and that from this state of darkness and distress they must emerge into one of great spiritual peace and ecstatic joy. These vivid emotions and striking experiences are regarded as the elements of true Christian conversion, and as essential ingredients in vital religion. It seems to be thought that no one can be a true follower of Christ, unless he has been favored with them. They become identified, in the minds of many, with pure and undefiled religion in the soul. We have long known that these views have exerted an injurious influence upon many individuals; have either been, in the minds of some, a hindrance to the reception and enjoyment of the Gospel, or, in the minds of others, the basis on which they rest their spiritual hopes. Some we have known, who had not enjoyed these vivid emotions and striking experiences. And therefore they dared not indulge the hope that they could be accepted of God, or regarded with favor by Christ. They dared not go forward in a Christian profession, and were paralyzed in their efforts to cultivate the Christian virtues and graces. And yet they were, to all appearance, humble, devout and prayerful, studying carefully the Bible, and seeking in all things to obey its instructions. But, in

consequence of erroneous views in regard to the necessity of vivid experiences, they have passed through life sorrowing, and have gone to their grave without the cheering support of a Christian hope. Then we have known others, who were rejoicing in their Christian hope, while yet they neglected to maintain Christian characters. They believed themselves to be Christians, not because they were daily and hourly striving to obey Christ and to breathe his spirit, but in consequence of some previous religious experiences. In both of these ways are the views, to which we have alluded, doing injury. Professor Upham, in both the "Interior Life" and the "Life of Faith," strikes at the root of these errors, by assigning to vivid emotions and striking experiences their appropriate place, by confining them to their proper sphere. He speaks upon the subject after this manner.

"We will suppose the case of a person, who is the subject of a divine operation. Under the influence of this inward operation, he experiences, to a considerable extent, new views of his own situation, of his need of a Saviour, and of the restoration of his soul to God in spiritual union. The operation, which has been experienced so far, is purely intellectual. Of the necessity and value of such intellectual influences, there can be no doubt. But I believe it is generally conceded, that, in themselves alone, they do not, and cannot constitute religion. But in addition to this, we will suppose, that an effect, and perhaps a very decided effect, has been experienced in the emotive part, which in its action is subsequent to that of the intellect. The person has very pleasant emotions. The perception of new truth, as we should naturally expect, gives him happiness; and the perception of its relation to his salvation gives him still more happiness. He is very happy. He begins to speak a new language. His mouth is filled with praise. But has such a person religion, as his friends are very desirous to believe, and very apt to declare? He has an *experience* undoubtedly. We are willing to admit, that he has a valuable experience; an experience, which is naturally preparatory to religion, and is closely connected with it; and looks very much like it. But if the experience stops here, in such a manner as to constitute a merely emotional experience, and without reaching and affecting a still more inward and important part of the mind, as seems sometimes to be the case, we cannot with good reasons regard it as a truly religious experience, meaning by the terms an experience which meets the expectations and the demands of God, and is saving." *

* Interior Life, pp. 178, 179.

And again he says: —

"We may probably discover in these principles," (those he had been endeavoring to establish,) "the reason, why it is, that, in times of especial religious attention, so many persons, who appeared to be much engaged in religion for a season, subsequently lose their interest, and become, both in practice and feeling, assimilated to the world. Such persons are undoubtedly the subjects of an inward experience; and this experience, in common parlance, is frequently called a religious experience, but it is obviously defective in the essential particular of not having a *root*."*

We make a single extract more upon this point, from the "Life of Faith."

"The emotions in their various kinds, both joyous and sorrowful, arise on many occasions very different from each other; and oftentimes have nothing to do with religion; and at their best estate may be regarded merely as the attendants and accessories of religion. The true view, therefore, is that emotional states, or mere temporary feelings of joy and sorrow, in distinction from the permanent state of love, may or may not involve the fact of religion. The man, who has them, may possess religion, or he may be destitute of it. In forming a judgment, therefore, of a man's religious character from his joys or sorrows, however excited they may be, it is necessary to be very careful. But no man need be solicitous in respect to the reality and truth of his religion, whether his joys or his sorrows be more or less, who, having entirely renounced himself, has that faith in God, which works by love and purifies the heart." — p. 90.

We anticipate, we repeat, great good from the publication and circulation in the Christian community of sentiments like these. They will tend to free the public mind from many false notions; will serve as a check to the extravagances too often witnessed in times of revival, and make religion a more simple and rational matter, commending itself to the better judgment of the head as well as to the warmer affections of the heart. And the Gospel itself will find increased favor with thinking men, when it is seen that the highest degree of spirituality of the affections and of the character is perfectly consistent with the highest degree of intellectual improvement, with the best exercises of the reason and the judgment.

* Interior Life, p. 181.

In another respect we have been gratified with the perusal of Professor Upham's volumes. They serve to confirm a belief we have for a long time entertained, that whenever our minds are directed to the spiritual and the practical in religion — whenever we are engaged in endeavors to promote the true spiritual life of the soul, or the practical godliness of the character, either in ourselves or others, — we make very little use of the language of sectarian theology. It naturally loses the prominent place it may have before held in our minds. We do not become, perhaps, any the less Trinitarians or Unitarians, than before. But we find less occasion for the use of the terms, expressions and doctrines, peculiar to these two classes of views. We find, when seeking to promote our own spiritual and practical improvement, that we are ourselves more of Christians than we are of sectarians. And we rejoice to find others, sustaining different denominational relations from those which we sustain, speaking and writing very much in the way in which we should upon the same subjects. We rejoice that they too, when treating of topics of this practical and spiritual character, show themselves to be more of Christians than of sectarians. This is a conviction we have long cherished. We repeat that we have been gratified to have it confirmed by the perusal of the works we have noticed. Professor Upham is a conscientious Trinitarian; and there are scattered through these books peculiar expressions, naturally growing out of a belief in the doctrines of Trinitarianism, or allusions to those doctrines, which flow almost involuntarily from the abundance of the heart that is attached to them. Still, these doctrines are not interwoven into the very texture of the work, as the essential elements, on which the whole depends for its character and influence. As you read the volumes, you may mark out, as enclosed in parentheses, every expression derived from a Trinitarian belief, every allusion to Trinitarian doctrines, and the general tenor of the argument or explanation, in which they occur, will not be marred nor weakened by their omission. But, in addition to this incidental confirmation of views we have delighted to cherish, we find other and more positive support for them. In the "Life of Faith" there is a chapter devoted to the consideration of the "relation of faith to energy of

action." In this chapter the writer quotes the Apostle Paul, where he says, "We believe, and therefore speak," and follows up his quotation with these remarks.

"Faith always has its object. And the inquiry naturally presents itself, what was it, which the Apostle Paul believed, that thus opened his heart of love and his lips of eloquence, and sent him forth a preacher through the world? He believed in God's moral government; he believed in God's commands; he believed in the immortality of the soul; he believed in man's fallen and depraved condition; he believed in the advent of Jesus Christ, in his crucifixion, and in his sacrifice for sin; he believed in the presence and power of the Holy Ghost; he believed in the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, and the retributions of eternity. Having faith, as he did, in these great truths, truths sublime in themselves and deeply operative and renovating in their application, he found a motive, an impulse to the highest action, which he could find nowhere else. It was religious truth, the truth *believed in*, and the truth *felt*, which was the inspiration of his life of labor." — p. 248.

Here is a Trinitarian, seeking to ascertain and state the items of belief which gave Paul his energy. And yet he has not used the technical phrases of a Trinitarian creed. Nor has he employed the technical terms of the Unitarian belief. He has expressed himself, we suppose, very much as a Unitarian, of the same honesty and fairness, would have done; for even the Unitarian, in such an analysis of Paul's belief, would have employed terms more general than the narrow limits of any sectarian theology, even his own, would afford. Thus are the views we have held on this point confirmed, and the hope we have rejoiced to entertain, of a final reunion of Christians of all sects on some broad ground held by them in common, strengthened.

We have completed what we wished to say of the "Life of Faith;" but, as we have spoken somewhat generally of the class of Christians, with whom, as we have supposed, Mr. Upham sympathizes, we wish to add a few words more in regard to this religious manifestation. We believe, then, that the "Oberlin Perfectionists" have been, and are, destined to be instruments of great good in the Christian community, — not so much by converting large numbers to the full belief of their peculiar speculations, as by an indirect influence, in awakening even those, who may differ from them in speculation, to higher aims and holier purposes.

The speculation by which they are distinguished, the possibility of the attainment of perfection in holiness in this life, is one to which they seem to have been driven by the peculiar opinions of the Christian sects among whom they first made their appearance. The Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists are represented by President Mahan, as believing that no one can enter upon the happiness of heaven, unless perfectly holy. And consequently they hold the doctrine, that "the Christian is perfectly sanctified at, or a few minutes before, death, and never at an earlier period." This view seems to regard sanctification, not as an attainment to be secured by God's blessing upon efforts put forth for that purpose, but as a gift bestowed without reference to individual effort. The absurdity of this position is well set forth by President Mahan, by two distinct considerations. "1st. The grace which sanctifies the believer amid the gloom and wreck and distraction of dissolving nature, would, if applied, have sanctified him at an earlier period. 2d. No other reason can be assigned for this grace being thus withheld, but the supposition that God can be better glorified, and his kingdom better advanced, by saints *partially*, than wholly consecrated to their sacred calling."* With the tenets held by those among whom President Mahan had received his education, this absurdity has placed him just where we should suppose it would place him, and the arguments, with which he meets those from whom he has ventured to differ in opinion on this point, seem to us unanswerable on their general principles. But the subject does not present the same difficulty to our minds, in consequence of our embracing a different philosophy in regard to the connection between this life and the future. Believing as we do, that at death the soul passes on, from one state of being to a different, without any change in its moral or spiritual condition, the subject of dispute between the Perfectionists and their opponents is stripped of its difficulty and loses its importance. Our Saviour, as it seems to us, has in a great degree broken down the wall of separation between this life and the next, and taught us that there may be a resurrection to immortal life within the soul, even in this world, and that whoever truly liveth, in the spiritual acceptation of the term, in this

* Mahan on Christian Perfection, p. 47.

world, shall never die. If, then, the soul passes on from the present to the future life, the two may be regarded as but parts of the same whole. And the attainments in holiness which are secured here, will be so much gained in regard to the attainments to be secured hereafter. When, therefore, we are exhorted by our Saviour to seek for perfection, we suppose him to be speaking to the spirit of man, not merely as an inhabitant of earth, but as immortal in its nature. We can, with these views, exhort men to seek for perfection in holiness. Are we asked, if this attainment be within the limits of possibility? We answer, that the attainment of perfection in holiness is within the reach of the spiritual nature of man. Are we asked, if it be attainable in this life? We answer, that it is no more important to settle that question, than to determine whether the attainment could be secured at a particular age, the age of forty years, for example. The individual may live on beyond that period. All progress made in holiness before that age, will be so much gain in regard to what is to be made after passing that period. So men will live on after death, and all that is secured before death, will be so much gain in regard to the progress to be made in the spiritual world. Believing, then, that, as spiritual beings, we may reach, and are required to reach, perfection in holiness, we can feel ourselves under obligation to strive strenuously and perseveringly for its attainment; we can put forth volitions to secure it, even though we may be indifferent to the question, whether the object of our efforts will be secured this week or next, this year or next, in this life or in the life that is to come. Still, although by our belief in regard to the connection between this life and the next we are freed from the difficulties which have driven the Oberlin Perfectionists to their peculiar position, we must confess that a perusal of their writings has deepened in our hearts a sense of the importance of constantly aiming at high attainments in holiness.

But the greatest good to be accomplished by the class of Christians of which we are speaking, will be among those with whom they have been, and, we believe, still are connected in their denominational relations. And it will be the result of the entire change, which will be produced in the whole theory of the purpose of Christ's mission on

earth, the nature of all religious influence, and the object of all religious effort. Professor Cowles, in his little work on holiness, gravely discusses the following question: — "What was God's design in the plan of salvation? Was it merely or chiefly to save men from *hell*, or to save them from *sin*? Did his heart rest chiefly upon some means of pardon, so that he might raise them to heaven, or did it rather rest upon 'redeeming them from all iniquity,' restoring his own effaced image in their souls, and making them *fit* for the purity and the songs of the upper temple? The latter most clearly." This position he proceeds to maintain by able arguments. Among those for whom Professor Cowles especially writes, there was need of a grave and full discussion of this question. Long have views of the atonement been held and advocated and urged upon the attention of the Christian community, which imply, and leave upon the minds of the people the impression, that the purpose of Christ's mission was to save men from the punishment of sin hereafter, rather than to make them holy here. And what a vast change will be wrought in the Christian community, when it is believed and felt, that Christ's purpose, and God's design, was to make men holy — pure, virtuous, upright and affectionate here, as the appropriate preparation for happiness hereafter; — when it is believed and felt, that the great object of all religious effort is, to remove all sin, all social and moral evil from the world, and produce a heavenly state of society on earth, as preparatory to a state of still higher spiritual attainments and spiritual joys above. We hope, yea, we joyfully believe, that the period is approaching, when these views of the purpose of Christ's mission will pervade the Christian world, when the efforts of all Christians, how widely soever they may be separated in speculative opinion, will be directed to the purification of their own hearts and lives from all unholiness, and to the removal of all wrong-doing from the earth, with a unity of purpose and an energy of will never before known. J. W.

Art. VII. — LEONARDO DA VINCI'S PAINTING OF THE LAST SUPPER.

This subject is suggested to us by an excellent engraving of the painting, which has lately appeared, executed by an American engraver, Dick. It is esteemed by connoisseurs the best engraving that has been produced on this side of the Atlantic. It is not indeed taken from the original, which in its present state an American artist would hardly be expected to have at once the opportunity and the learning and skill to copy, but from Morghen's celebrated engraving of it, which has been so faithfully reproduced that the two are hardly to be distinguished from each other at the distance at which one generally looks at large pictures. When more nearly scrutinized, there is considerable inferiority in the expression of several of the countenances; as in the mouth of John there is missed a certain mingling of simplicity and sensibility, which we find in the Italian plate, and in more than one of the stronger faces something theatrical has stolen in.

In this country we have so little opportunity to enjoy the fine arts, we are so much shut out from that world of beauty in which not a few of the best minds on the other side of the water have their chief, and a very sweet and beautiful existence, that we cannot but think it a happy circumstance, whenever any of the finished works of the great geniuses of that sphere are brought within our reach, either by excellent copies or by faithful engravings. This painting of Da Vinci's is well known by a multitude of miserable representations, has furnished a wretched frontispiece to many biblical publications, and has been sold in caricatures of many sizes and qualities. The one good engraving of it by Raphael Morghen was so very expensive, as to be beyond the reach of common people. And now this copy of Morghen by Dick is so cheap, that almost anybody may have it. It has already gone up upon many walls, and we feel no little satisfaction in seeing it there. As one of the most beautiful and perfect of all the conceptions of art, it is, even as here engraved, ever valuable; nay, to minds educated to a susceptibility for such things, invaluable and unspeakably interesting, as a thing of beauty,

a representation of life, a combination of genius and the production of a perfectly accomplished talent. But it is also valuable in a religious way, as a very affecting representation of the scene so prominent in the Christian imagination, and symbolical of so much in the Christian world. It preaches more persuasively than a sermon, it comments on the characters of the Apostles more distinctly and graphically than the annotator, and by fixing permanently that great event in a definite form before the eye, it wins the imagination to linger on it, corrects our narrow ideas by the truer and larger conceptions of genius, and becomes the suggestor and the nucleus of a multitude of sacred affections of our own. The introduction of such a work as this into a house is of more importance to those that live in it, than all the ornaments of mechanic art, and might be well purchased with the sacrifice of a convenience. The room becomes somewhat sacred where it is; a certain moral illumination is spread, and the tempers and occupations of the family are guarded and presided over, as it were by a household angel. At a small price one gets what is much more to him than tapestries and carpets and mirrors. By the magic of art and the multiplication of mechanic contrivance, the poor man ornaments his apartment with the image, which in the happy moments of a sacred age visited and adorned the quiet recesses of a great, a pure and a consummately instructed soul. Thanks to this power of man, with which Heaven has endowed him as if to efface the boundaries of the material world, the chance wanderers from heaven, once seduced into the retreats of earthly genius, are fixed and spell-bound, and made, though covered over indeed with a veil of time, the possession of the race. The material hinders, obscures, decays; but the conception makes itself known, its representation is copied, repeated, — the vision becomes a permanent part of the imagination of civilized men.

Now that this engraving has attracted the attention of some of our readers, it may not be uninteresting to hear something again of a very old subject, the original painting at Milan. It is no wonder that it is so prominent among pictures and has excited such a distant interest; for the subject is the greatest of all the fine subjects for the Christian pencil; the painter was certainly one of the most

distinguished geniuses of his class; and this was the masterpiece even among his works. And still more, it is singled out as the subject of an interest of a very melancholy kind, inasmuch as by a deplorable fortune it has been peculiarly the victim of calamity and decay.

Leonardo da Vinci lived at the time when modern art was arising as part of a newly awakened civilization, and the Church, and the finer imagination of men, to which the Church gave so many subjects and supplied so large a part of its imagery, wanted such an organ as only that could afford; at a time when the pencil supplied, for the mass of the people, the place of the pen and the press, and when the ability to excite and correct and determine the religious imagination made one a leader and former of his generation. He was contemporaneous with the founders of the other schools, with Michael Angelo, Raphael, and Titian. It was in the middle of the fifteenth century, that he was born of an unknown mother at the chateau of Vinci, in the valley of the Arno, where the traveller may still see the ruins of the castellated edifice, in the midst of the little village which it once protected. He was unusually endowed with the qualities which fitted him for the life of a knightly gentleman, bodily strength and dexterity and grace and courtesy of manners; but his governing characteristic being observed to be a passion and faculty for art, he was put by his father under the instruction of a painter and sculptor of no small merit, one Verocchio, under whom he acquired such proficiency that it is said the master in vexation abandoned the art, where he saw such unpractised hands taking from him the palm.

It has been well said,* that the state of the art at that time was such that great genius could display itself with peculiar advantage. "It had been for two centuries emancipated from the stiffness and leanness of the Byzantine school, and it had started on a new course through the imitation of nature and the delineation of the noble traits of character. The artist felt a new impulse, and was successful to that point to which his feelings drove him, and where the instinct of genius was sufficient; but he did not understand his own work, could not give account to him-

* Goethe, Abendmahl von Leonardo da Vinci; in his works, vol. 39, Cotta. 1830.

self of what was good in it, or of what was wanting, and knew not how to supply a deficiency if he perceived it." In the works of that time we see the finest conceptions vainly laboring for an adequate expression; they do not fail from want of genius in the painter, but seem to die from the art not being yet adequate to receive and embody them. In all we seem to see a defeated effort, a semi-articulateness, a half-life, like that of the frogs in the mud of the river in the East, which only make out to get half formed, and while their lower extremities still stick in the clay, are stiffened by the increasing heat of the sun.

"Then it was," says Goethe, "that Leonardo da Vinci came; and while he had an eye for the imitation of nature, he had at the same time the insight to perceive that nature had, behind the outwardly apparent which he could so felicitously copy, secret principles of working, which it was the painter's business, as a follower of nature, to discover and apply. He therefore labored to get possession of the laws of organic structure, the principles of proportion, and sought for rules by which he should group, posture, and color his objects in the given field; in short aimed, by getting at the hidden laws according to which all true effects must be produced, to make art not merely the diligent copyist, but the younger sister of nature. He studied especially her workings in the variety of feature, wherein the momentary passions of the mind, as well as its permanent character, stamp themselves on the countenance. In this study he never was weary, and most remarkable fruits of it we have in this picture of the Last Supper."

Thanks to the benign rule of Lorenzo the Magnificent, Leonardo enjoyed during his youth and early manhood that quiet, which is so much loved by men of contemplative minds, and which was a very rare boon at that time in those perpetually distracted and warring Italian republics. If he did not enjoy directly the patronage of Lorenzo, he breathed the new atmosphere which he and his men of letters spread over Florence, and to the age of thirty cultivated the great talent which was to make itself so marvellously felt. In 1482, (not, as Goethe in the essay above quoted erroneously asserts, in consequence of the troublous times which followed the death of Lorenzo, but ten years before that lamented event,) he went, on invita-

tion of Ludovico surnamed il Moro, to Milan, where he was established for seventeen years, the most important period of his life. Here he made himself eminent not merely as a painter, but as a sculptor, a musician, a poet, and an engineer. In all these characters his genius seems to have highly signalized him. He first charmed his patron with his lyre; he sang delicate verses of his own improvisation; he wrote essays on art which remain unrivalled; and in the construction of the canal by which the waters of the Adda are brought through the Val Tellino, a distance of two hundred miles, to the capital, he displayed a knowledge and invention which were at that day unsurpassed. This remains a substantial monument of his skill; but a most singular fatality seems to have hung over the masterpieces of his art, and though his fame can never perish, those works of his in which his consummate powers were most perfectly exhibited, have been from various causes destroyed and utterly lost to the world. This was the case with a colossal equestrian statue, which he modelled at Milan, and which was broken to pieces in an attempt to drag it as part of a great procession through the streets; and after he had restored it, it was again pitched upon as a target by the French soldiers when they took possession of the city in 1599, and thus "the labor of sixteen years" at once annihilated. Then too, a cartoon of the battle of Anghiari, which, on returning in this year to Florence, he had made in competition with Michael Angelo, and which is greatly celebrated by his contemporaries, has been also destroyed, and we know it only by means of a copy which remains. And lastly, the great picture, the engraving of which has suggested these remarks, has faded and mouldered, and experienced almost every calamity which neglect, or presumption, or brutality, or accident, or time could bring upon it, and looks out as it were through a heavy, melancholy mist yet for a few years upon the world, and then will have vanished with its lost sisters into the realm of thought. A sad fatality this, by which such footsteps of angels have been washed away!

But the Demiurgus, by whose wrath those things perished, has allowed other works to remain, and brought down to us many a wondrous image from this son of the harmonies. Besides all that are in Italy, there are the "Christ among

the doctors" of the National Gallery in London, and that indescribable beauty, the celebrated portrait called "Mona Lisa" at the Hague, and at the latter place also a picture of Leda and her children, called by the dunces of the guide-books "Charity," and a few other exceedingly prized pieces which bear the mark of his genius and of his patient hand.

On returning to Florence in the last year of the century, he found no mean rival waiting for him in the person of Michael Angelo, and in popularity and in the patronage of the princes he was obliged to yield to him. This was owing, it is said, to his slowness of execution, which wearied his patrons with waiting, before he had begun to satisfy his own delicate and perfect taste. From this harassing rivalship he escaped, by accepting in 1515 the invitation of Francis I., of France, who had seen at Milan the Last Supper in its first glory, and taking up his residence in a new metropolis. There he lived four years without executing any new works, and died in 1519, as it is related, in the effort to raise himself from his bed when he received a visit from the King.

We turn now to our special subject, the picture of the Last Supper, which Leonardo painted on the wall of the refectory of the Dominican convent at Milan. We will lay before the reader some extracts from the above quoted essay of the great German critic, with the view of assisting him in a comprehension of the meaning, and of the peculiar beauties, difficulties, and calamities of this great work. The essay has been translated, we observe from a notice by Goethe himself, into English, by Noehden, (London, 1821). That translation we have not seen. Perhaps it is not to be found in this country. We are obliged to make such a version as we can from the original.

Goethe begins by remarking, that the place where the picture is painted is first of all to be considered; for that in the choice of the subject in reference to that, the wisdom of the painter is particularly exhibited. "Could anything fitter or nobler be imagined for a refectory, than a Last Supper which was to be sacred for all times and for the whole world?" And herein the picture is particularly interesting to us, — that the subject did not belong peculiarly to the Roman Catholic Church, but to the Church in

all time, and that it was treated in such a manner as to be equally symbolical to every nation and time as to his own. No gilded halos surround the heads, Peter is not burdened with the keys, nor are any saints in monkish garments introduced as assisting; but all is liberal, untechnical, simple, appealing to the Christian heart, nay, to the human heart, to the best and most universal sensibilities of our nature, so that in the various copies of itself, manifold in their degrees of imperfection, which, while it is fading away, it has called into life, and sent, as it were like messengers from Leonardo's heart, all over Europe and into the residences of other races, it will continue to charm and raise the soul for generations upon generations, wherever tenderness or generosity of heart is found. But by these remarks we interrupt the connexion of our author's criticism. In reference to the happy choice of a subject, he goes on to say: —

"In travelling many years ago we saw this eating-hall, before its original arrangement had been disturbed. Opposite the entrance on the narrow side, at the bottom of the room, stood the table of the prior; along the two sides the tables of the monks, raised all one step above the floor; and when you faced about, you then saw on the fourth wall, over the door, which was not very high, a fourth table painted, and Christ and his disciples seated at it, as if a part of the company. At the hour of eating that must have been indeed a sight to see, the prior's table and Christ's standing over against one another, with the monks' shut in between. And here we understand the wisdom of the painter in taking for his model the very tables there in use. The table-cloth itself, with its creases, its figured stripes and knotted corners, came evidently, too, out of the convent laundry; and the dishes, plates, cups and other table furniture one may see are taken from those which the friars habitually used."

Goethe goes on to say, that "this was not the time for attempting an approximation to an uncertain obsolete posture," — that to have stretched out the sacred company here on cushions, after the fashion of the ancients, would have greatly impaired the effect; for now "the past was to be approximated to the present, and Christ be made to sup with the Dominicans in Milan."

In other respects also the management of the subject was such that it could not fail to produce a great effect. "About ten feet above the ground, the thirteen figures, all drawn half larger than life, occupy a space of eight and twenty Paris feet in length. Only two of them, at the opposite ends of the table, are seen entire; the rest are half-figures. And in this the artist found his advantage in necessity. All moral expression belongs exclusively to the upper part of the body; and the feet are in such cases as this always in the way. Here then the painter grouped eleven figures, leaving them concealed below the waist by the table and table-cloth, and letting the feet scarcely appear in modest twilight below.

"Now let one transport himself to the spot, imagine the decorum and outward quiet, which reign in the dining-hall of a religious establishment, — and admire the artist, who breathes into his composition a passionate agitation, and while he brings it as near to nature as possible, puts it in contrast with the surrounding reality."

The cause of this agitation is, of course, understood to be the declaration of Christ, "Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me," — one of you is about to betray me, — referring to an immediate danger, an impending fate. The words have already been spoken, and all the company are thrown thereby into the greatest alarm. "He sits in silence, his eyes cast downward, his head gently inclined, the whole attitude, the gesture of the arms and hands, all repeating the same melancholy declaration: 'Yes; it is even so! there is one among you who betrays me.'"

We will now quote Goethe's observations on a peculiar means by which expression is given to the figures, and then his comments on the figures severally, as to what, especially, we are to understand them to express; for here there is variety of judgment, and the little pamphlet that is sold with this American engraving gives but a miserable and beggarly account of the matter. We will lay our author's criticism before the reader without interrupting it with any remarks of our own.

"Before we go farther, we must speak of a great means, by which chiefly Leonardo enlivens this picture, — the movement, namely, of the hands; which is what only an Italian

could have invented. With his nation the whole body is full of soul, all the members take part in every expression of feeling, of passion, of thought. By means of different shapings and motions of the hands the Italian says in effect: 'What is that to me! — Come hither! — That is a rogue, beware of him! — He will not live long! — This is an important point. Mark this well, my hearers!' To such a peculiarity Leonardo, who gave the greatest heed to every thing characteristic, must have directed his searching eye. In this respect the present picture is unique; and one cannot consider it too closely. Every gesture is perfectly consonant with the corresponding expression of the countenance; in addition to which there is a connection and contrast of the different members of the composition, which the eye immediately comprehends, and which is exceedingly admirable.

"In general the figures on either side of the Lord may be considered together in threes, as in each case they are conceived by the artist, too, thus in union, and related together; while at the same time they are held in reference to their neighbors. First on the right hand of Christ, John, Judas, Peter.

"Peter, the farthest off, moves, agreeably to his impetuous character, on hearing the words of the Lord, rapidly up behind Judas, who looking upwards in fright, bends forward over the table, with the right hand holds firmly grasped the purse, and with the left makes an involuntary spasmodic motion, as if to say, 'What may that mean? What is to come of that?' Peter has meanwhile with his left hand laid hold on the right shoulder of John, pointing to Christ, and at the same time instigating the beloved disciple to ask, who the traitor is. A knife-handle in his right hand he thrusts by accident involuntarily into the ribs of Judas; and thus a cause is happily devised for that frightened, forward movement of his. By this movement he overturns a salt-cellar," (an accident deemed by the superstitious peculiarly ominous, the introduction of which here is called in question, as of very doubtful propriety.) "This group may be regarded as the first conceived of the picture; it is the most perfect.

"While now on the right of the Lord, without any violence of gesture, a threat is made of immediate revenge, there

spring up on the left the most lively amazement and horror at the treachery. James the elder starts back with terror, spreads wide his arms, and with head bowed down looks fixedly, and motionless, forward, like one who thinks he sees the horror of which he has just heard. Thomas appears behind his shoulder, and approaching the Saviour, raises the forefinger of his right hand towards his forehead. Philip, the third of this group, produces the most lovely effect in rounding it; he has got up, bends forward towards the Master, lays his hands on his breast, saying most clearly, 'Lord, it is not I! Thou knowest it! Thou knowest my pure heart. It is not I.'

"And the neighboring and last three on this side give us new matter for consideration. They are conversing on the terrible thing they have heard of. Matthew turns his face with ardor to his two fellows on the left, while he stretches out his hands swiftly towards the Master, and thus, by means of the most exquisite stroke of art, binds his group with the preceding. Thaddeus shows the most violent astonishment, doubt and suspicion; he has laid the left hand open on the table, and raised the right in such a manner, as if he were about to strike with the back of it into the left; a gesture which is yet seen in men of natural character, when they at some unexpected incident would express, 'Did not I say so! Have not I always supposed it!' Simon, extremely dignified, sits at the end of the table, and in consequence we see his whole figure; he, the eldest of all, is richly clad with folding drapery; his countenance and gesture show that he is struck and thoughtful, but not agitated nor hardly moved.

"If we now turn our eyes directly to the opposite end of the table, we see Bartholomew, who stands on his right foot, with the left thrown over it, supporting his forward-bent body with both hands laid quietly on the table. He is listening, probably to hear what answer John's question will obtain from the Lord; for it appears to be from this whole side that the suggestion of that inquiry has proceeded. James the younger, next to and behind Bartholomew, lays the left hand on Peter's shoulder, as Peter his on John's; but James mildly, merely desiring information, while Peter already threatens revenge. And so too, in like manner as Peter presses forward behind Judas, James the less reaches

forward behind the Apostle Andrew, who, as one of the most important figures, with half-raised arms shows full the palms of his expanded hands, — a decisive expression of amazement, occurring only once in this picture, though in other works of this artist, which are conceived with less genius and thoroughness, but too often repeated."

This will, we think, give to common beholders a better idea of the significance of this so well known composition, and we must think that it is, for the most part, exceedingly well and acutely observed. We will use our German friend still farther for the sake of acquainting the reader with some of the *technical methods* which Leonardo followed in the preparation of his work, the cause, alas! in part, of the ruin into which it has fallen.

"Leaving now much unsaid concerning form and feature, gesture, drapery, let us turn to another part of the matter, from which we can expect nothing but sorrow. That is the mechanical, chemico-physical, and technical means, which the artist applied in preparation of this noble work. From the latest investigations it is but too clear, that it was painted on the wall *in oil*. This mode of painting, which had for a long time been in use, must have recommended itself extremely to Leonardo, who with his fine eye for nature aimed to penetrate into her inmost secrets, that he might again invest them with form and make them felt anew.

"How great and daring was this ambition is obvious, when we consider that nature works innerly, and must prepare infinitely various means before she becomes, after a thousand trials, capable of developing the organs out of one another and upon one another, and of producing such a form as that of man; which, while it reveals the highest inward perfections, seems rather anew to conceal than to solve the enigma of nature.

"Now to represent conscientiously the inward in the outward, the greatest masters made their highest and only aim; they aspired not only to copy with exact truth the conception of the object, but the copy must take the place of nature herself, nay, in realization of the idea outdo her. In this attempt the greatest completeness and detail were, first of all, requisite; which imply a slow and gradual proceeding. And then it was indispensable, that there should

be opportunity for correction. These advantages, as well as many more, are secured in oil-painting.

"It has been found, accordingly, after strict investigation, that Leonardo laid on upon the plastering of the wall a mixture of mastic, pitch, and other ingredients, with a warm iron. And then, in order to procure a perfectly smooth ground, as well as greater security against outward influences, he gave the whole a delicate coat of white lead, and of yellow and fine ochres. But even this providence appears to have injured the work; for although this delicate coat, so long as the pigments laid on it continued supplied with oil, sustained itself from them, it lost, as the oil dried up, its consistency and began to split, and then the dampness of the wall got in and begat mould from which the picture by degrees grew dim."

Goethe then gives the many other causes of the picture's ruin. The wall, built by the monks on compulsion, contained very deleterious materials; and their injurious qualities were brought out by the dampness of the place, which was so low as to be several times laid under water. Then the disorders of war and innumerable other misfortunes, which fell upon Lombardy in the first half of the sixteenth century, caused it to be entirely neglected and abandoned to its fate. In the middle of that century it is already spoken of as half-destroyed. At last the whole precious surface, cracking up in little crusts, began to scale off and fall down piece-meal. "A century after this," to use the words of an Edinburgh reviewer, "the venerable fathers, whose lot it was to occupy the same room with it during a very interesting portion of the day, observing (with their wonted sagacity) that the straight line which joined their table and the kitchen passed through the centre of the picture, and by no means through the door, and aware, from instinctive science, that the straight line between those two points was the shortest, thought proper to cut through the wall and destroyed a part of the principal figure, and the two next it." The very efforts for its preservation were among the causes of its ruin. In 1726 one Bellotti was employed by the ignorant monks to freshen it, and covered it accordingly from top to bottom with a secret varnish, and again in 1770 one Mazza, being commissioned to "restore" it, actually proceeded to paint over all the

heads, and even dared to scrape the plastering in some places smooth with an instrument of iron; until the general outcry of its pious admirers put a stop to his work, while the heads of Matthew, Thaddeus and Simon yet remained untouched.

When Bonaparte led his victorious army into Italy, the fame of this picture drew him to the spot, and there he signed on his knees an order that the place should be respected. But the generals who came after him disregarded this command, beat in the door and turned the apartment into a stable. The filthy exhalations collected on the walls, and trickling down left their marks all over the surface on which Leonardo had labored with such precious and patient art. At last however the place was cleared, and the doorway walled up, and visitors could get in to see it only through the pulpit, from which in old times a monk harangued the company assembled at the tables below. Afterwards, in time of peace, it was again made clean and approachable, but remains unfurnished and desolate, and the painting irrecoverable. Not that, as is sometimes represented, it no longer presents anything beautiful to the eye. It is not yet *destroyed*. You have still before you a wondrous vision, but seen as 'through a glass, darkly,' like much else that is divine in the world.

Fortunately several copies were made at a very early date, one by Marco da Oggione, a pupil of the painter, (whom Lanzi thinks is to be reckoned among the best of the Milanese painters,) in the life-time of Leonardo, for the refectory of the convent at Castellazzo, where it is still preserved. In this copy there is a tradition that the master himself painted the head of the Saviour, which he never could prevail on himself to finish and left uncompleted in his own picture. Indeed, herein it is thought that Leonardo failed, and must have failed; that however it may be with the Apostles, no work of the hand can fill the Christian's idea of his Saviour; and that the greater the genius of the painter to call such a scene as this before us, the more evident must be his incapacity to portray that divine person, who is the centre of it. Vinci began with the Apostles and left the figure of Christ till the last, thinking that he would have grown to that greater measure by passing up to it through the rest. But he was doomed to feel

then the inadequacy of art. What the heart demanded he found not the talent to portray. If he used a less timid hand in inserting the head of the Master in the copy at Castellazzo, that circumstance enhances the value of Morghen's engraving, which is taken from that copy.

G. F. S.

Art VIII.—NOYES'S PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND CANTICLES.*

No writer in our language, either on this or the other side of the sea, has rendered such valuable service as Dr. Noyes, in that department of Sacred Literature, to which the volume before us belongs. We do not say this inconsiderately. We will take in the whole series of translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into the English tongue, extending over nearly a hundred years, from Chappelow and Heath, through Bishop Lowth and his school, down to Rev. Alfred Jenour and Albert Barnes, and maintain that no one among them all has deserved so well as our Hebrew Professor at Harvard College. His first work was an "Amended Version of the Book of Job," printed so long ago as 1827; of which a second edition appeared in 1838, in an improved form, with corrections and additions. His "New Translation of the Book of Psalms" followed in 1831, and of this we are glad to learn that another edition is preparing. The greater labor of "A New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, arranged in chronological order," was given to the public in three volumes; the first in 1833, and the other two in 1837. All these works were noticed in our journal from time to time, as they were brought forward; and on each successive occasion with a praise, that deserves to be on the increase. This eminent success has long made us wish that we might have at least one volume more from the same hand, corresponding to the rest, and completing what is called the Hagiographa of the Old Testament. The wish is at

---

* *A New Translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, with Introductions, and Notes, chiefly explanatory.* By George R. Noyes, D.D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, etc., and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 290.

last gratified by the book that we propose to make at present the subject of a few remarks.

We must acknowledge, that it does not carry with it the attractiveness or importance of its predecessors. Its subjects are inferior. What can come after the sublime dramatic poem of Job; the religious odes of the Hebrew minstrels, ranging through every variety of tones, from the groan of the penitent to the shout of the conqueror, with the harp of King David ringing at their head; and the "goodly fellowship of the Prophets," not gathered into a circle, but spreading down in a line, from Joel and Amos to Malachi, over a space of four hundred years? What can be added to a divine train like this, and hope to share the same honors, or to close it upon equal terms? The homely wisdom of the Proverbs must seem tame, we are ready to think, and the gloomy prose of the Preacher repulsive, compared with the impassioned strains of a poetry that has filled the earth with the holy breath of its devotion. And as for the love-verses of the Canticles, — for that is all they are, — they never seemed to us very captivating specimens even of their own kind; so alien is the extravagant imagery of the old Eastern world, from the ideas and tastes of modern refinement.

And yet we shall see reason, on reflection, to qualify the judgment thus broadly expressed, not a little. We do not think this volume less interesting than those that went before it. It certainly does not yield to them at all in the careful ability with which it has been written. In some respects it has even the advantage over them. It is much richer in its annotations than either of the rest, with the exception of Job. Its contents admit of its being illustrated throughout with the most agreeable and various learning. It gives a satisfactory answer, also, to many questions of curiosity, which will rise in the minds of the most cursory readers of the Jewish Scriptures, and which have perplexed the judgments of the most attentive.

The Book of Proverbs is much more than its name would seem to indicate. It contains long passages of the noblest order of beauty, and sustained upon the highest flight of imagination. We need but instance in the two descriptions of Wisdom in the eighth and ninth chapters. Neither are its sententious sayings of a dull and monotonous

character. Sometimes they are witty; and it is pleasant to have them brushed from the dust that time and mistake have strown over them, and made to sparkle with something of their original playfulness. Sometimes they are enigmatical, and dark as a riddle; and then there is a satisfaction in having them cleared up by one whose researches have qualified him for the task. It is also true of it, as our author says in his Introduction, that "in a moral and religious point of view it is one of the most valuable portions of the Old Testament; giving a view of the Jewish religion and morality, as pervading the common life of the people, much more favorable than that which we receive from the accounts of the ceremonies and forms which are elsewhere enjoined."

When we pass from this book to that of Ecclesiastes, we come into an entirely different region. It is like leaving the open fields and the sunny hills for tangled thickets and dark, overhanging woods. The sounds that we hear around us are plaintive, full of doubt and woe. The thoughts that occupy us do not go abroad over nature, or deal with the pursuits and duties of practical life, but rather turn inward with a melancholy scrutiny upon a troubled mind. The scene is not laid in the house, or by the way, but among the mysterious problems of our being. The style of the original language, as the scholar reads it, is altogether of a different stamp from that of the foregoing book. Professor Stuart, in speaking of this difference, tells us that "Chaucer does not differ more from Pope than Ecclesiastes from Proverbs." The wording of this comparison is not a happy one. We might suppose at first that he meant to say just the reverse of what he intends; for it is the former work that carries so strongly the mark of a later date, and not the other, as the unlearned reader might be led to think from the Professor's language. It is a just comparison, however, in the point that was the only one designed. Ecclesiastes, or "Coheleth," as he prefers to call it, is written in a harsh, barbarous speech, that falls far below the courtly language of Solomon, in the golden age of the Hebrew Commonwealth, or of any of the writers that lived before the Captivity at Babylon.

The book has always found censurers, also, on account of its complaining and skeptical spirit; its dangerous doc-

trines, or its want of sound doctrine; and the strange inconsistencies that startle us between one part of it and another. Jerome, in the close of his commentary upon it, at xii. 13, writes thus: "The Hebrews say, that among other writings of Solomon that were worn out of use and retained no memory, this also seemed worthy of being effaced, since it pronounces the creatures of God to be vain, and accounts everything as nothing, and prefers eating and drinking and transient delights to all besides. But it deserves its authority, if but for this sentence alone, and should be placed in the number of the divine volumes, because it condenses its whole dispute and its whole description into the epitome, — that we should fear God, and keep his commandments." Dr. Noyes, in his Introduction to it, makes the best vindication of its author that the cause admits of. He describes him "as a man of wisdom, virtue and religion, according to the light which he had; not a fatalist, nor a skeptic, nor an Epicurean, in any offensive sense of those terms." With regard to "the seeming (?) inconsistencies" that run through it, we entirely agree with him in rejecting the theory, that would reconcile them by throwing the work into the form of dialogue; as some most learned men have done.* We recorded that dissent almost thirty years ago; on the grounds, that no such lines of division could be satisfactorily or fairly drawn, — that there was not a single direct reply anywhere, or anything like discussion, — and that finally, as an insuperable objection, on this supposition Solomon, "the wise king," would be the rash complainer, who was rebuked by the Mentor at his side. Certainly no romancer, writing under the fictitious name of another, would have been guilty of so stupid an invention as that. We agree, likewise, that there is no occasion for resorting to such an hypothesis. And yet it would hardly have arisen, if the inconsistencies had not been startling, and if there had not been a real difficulty in the case. This difficulty is well met and replied to, in the Introduction to which we have just referred. But there is another element

* Herder and Eichhorn suppose a dialogue held between two. Seiler, though the author of an excellent work on Hermeneutics, or the Laws of Interpretation, takes refuge in the hypothesis of three persons engaged in the conversation.

in the solution, which we consider to be of great importance. This is, the natural fluctuation of a disturbed and vehement spirit. Let us but imagine a mind contending with itself. Then both the obscurity and objection will grow less, if they do not disappear. Such a mind is now desponding, and now encouraged; at one time almost impious, and then returning to its sober reason; here wandering without rest, and there setting up some principle to which it fastens its confidence, or endeavors to do so. Is it inconsistent? Inconsistency is the very language of passionate and unsettled thoughts. The whole impression that the reading leaves upon us, we must acknowledge, is a sad one, — sad as a great part of human experience is, and of God's word also, — but in no degree is it immoral. The work favors nothing that resembles the worldling's merriment, or the cynic's indifference, or the fatalist's despair; but, on the contrary, is fixed in opposition to them all. It draws no conclusion that is at variance with its last words, which inculcate piety and obedience. It is one of the most affecting books that the canon contains, and none the less so for being far behind that full assurance of faith, which the Gospel only can inspire. It may be read with edification by all classes of persons; especially with the aid of such a translator and critic as it has now found.

We do not mean to say, that in every instance the sense that he attaches to the original is the one that recommends itself to us the most. In the doubtful passage, for example, iii. 11, which reads according to him: "God makes every thing good in its time; but he has put the world into the heart of man, so that he understands not the work which God does, from the beginning to the end;" we cannot help preferring the version of our old friends Augusti and De Wette: "He hath made everything beautiful in its time; also he hath set *the everlasting* in their heart; although no mortal can find out the work that God doeth, either from the beginning, or to the end." So in the 18th verse of the same chapter, we feel attached to the meaning which the same distinguished scholars have given it: "I said in my heart: concerning the sons of Adam, God has separated them (from all other creatures,) to see *if* they would account themselves as beasts." Our author's version is: "I said in my heart concerning the sons of men, that

God will prove them and see *that* they are like the beasts." If we are not entirely convinced that he is right by his elaborate note at the place, (p. 234,) we confess it somewhat mistrustfully, and with great deference to his larger attention to the subject, and profounder knowledge. It is not easy to come to a perfect agreement, and see things alike, in the midst of so much obscurity. Before leaving this question of *meanings*, — a question which we scarcely ever have felt disposed to raise with him through the whole course of his labors, — we would fain point to one passage more, that occurs in Proverbs xxv. 11. Our common translation has it: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver;" — a well-sounding comparison certainly, but not a very distinct one. We have indulged ourselves with thinking, ever since we engaged in these studies, that we might render it, — "apples of gold in baskets of silver," which would give not only a clear sense, but a very beautiful and appropriate one. So, or nearly enough so, Augusti and De Wette understood it, in their admirable German translation: "apples of gold in dishes of silver." But Dr. Noyes crosses our comfort by showing us "apples of gold with figures of silver," which is really next to showing us nothing at all. We not only find no aptness in the similitude, but no visible image whatever. He indeed refers us to Gesenius, as proving that the rendering which we desire "is not supported by Hebrew usage." We suppose he must be right. At the same time we are almost tempted to say, that if there is no authority for it, there ought to be.

The next book in the volume is the Canticles, or Solomon's Song, as it is commonly called. We cannot refer to it without remembering the saying of a witty divine, that he could see no other reason why the "Song of Solomon" was admitted into the Jewish Canon, while the "Wisdom of Solomon" had to content itself with its place in the Apocrypha, but that mankind loved singing better than instruction. We are not disposed to spend many words upon what is so little to our liking, though we completely justify its new translator in the course that he has taken in relation to it. We are glad that he did not conclude "to pass it by in significant and prudent silence." The simple fact that it is found where it is, was reason enough why he

should not have omitted it. The custom, that has been all but universal, of trying to allegorize it into some spiritual significance, lends it an interest apart from its own merits, and quite beyond them. There is weight, too, in the suggestion which he makes in his Introduction to it, that "even the cause of religion demands that it should be understood to be what it is." He has connected with it, both here and in his notes, a great deal of pleasant and useful information, such as will be welcome to the scholar, and at the same time can be appreciated by any intelligent reader. One of the most important topics thus touched on, is that which relates to the forming of the Old Testament into one collection; the principles had in view in the doing of it; and the time when it was probably done. These questions were naturally, if not unavoidably, brought up, in commenting on so strange a poem, or rather snatches of poetry, as "the Song of Songs." He is led to several very sensible remarks upon them, extending from the 136th to the 142d page. But we will get away from this part of our subject as fast as we can; — not without an apprehension that the Professor himself has lavished more learning than was necessary in illuminating this amatory rhapsody. We are willing to leave it to the Orientals, or whoever else can see any excellence in it. For our own part we frankly confess that it never delighted us.

We have a few words to say, and wish that we could make them more, as to the general correctness of taste that Dr. Noyes has displayed in accomplishing his long task. Much more than mere learning is needed, however accurate and various that may be, in order to make a good translation of writings like these, so peculiar in themselves, and so sacredly associated with the old words in which we have heard them read from our infancy. It is important, that he who undertakes such an office should be a master of all the resources of language, and have a nice discernment of the least shades of meaning. He should be wholly free from affectation. He should throw no finery of his own over the venerated pages. He should avoid all unusual phrases. He should employ a uniform style, neither colloquial nor inflated. He should respect the idioms of the tongue from which he translates. He should not deviate without cause from the simple forms of speech to which the readers

of the common version have been accustomed. This last consideration it is of special consequence to keep in view. No one should translate the Hebrew Scriptures into English, as if they had not been so translated before. The general pattern is set up, according to which he is to work. He cannot vary much from the figures of its phraseology, which time has endeared and hallowed, without giving reasonable offence.

Great trespasses have been committed against all these directions. Indeed, few of the English translators can be named, who have not sinned gravely on one or another of these counts. We might easily amuse or amaze our readers, by quoting examples in each kind, and from names, too, that have enjoyed no little reputation. Drs. Geddes, Good and Adam Clarke would furnish rare specimens. But rather than find fault with others, we would proceed at once to what we conceive to be the merits of the translator who has risen up among ourselves. He is remarkably free from the blemishes that have just been alluded to. His perception is true, his judgment sober, his taste pure. He commits no extravagances. He violates none of the rules of a sound criticism. We are anxious that he should receive great praise for such qualifications, because they are so seldom to be found. We pay him our most ample respect for the good sense, as well as the accurate learning, that he has brought to his task. If we could allow ourselves to qualify in the least these remarks, we should be tempted to say, that he might sometimes have kept closer to the common version than he has, and to the old idioms of the East, without any loss of clearness and with some gain in point of strength. In his anxiety to be simple, he may occasionally have allowed himself to be tame; and this, though a minor fault and on every account less than the one it would avoid, is to be regretted in a work of so much excellence. For example, that beautiful expression of the Psalmist, cvii. 10, "bound in affliction and iron," loses its spirit, when rendered, "bound with grievous irons." The ancient form of the hendiadys should certainly have been retained. It would have been a happy boldness, too good to be lost, even if it were but the invention of his predecessors; but it has the advantage of being literally exact.

We will cite another instance, that we think still more

illustrative of what we wish to say. The Book of Ecclesiastes opens as with a lament and cry: "Vanity of vanities!" We cannot feel the force of Dr. Noyes's objection to this form of language. He tells us, that it is "a Hebraism which does not harmonize with the English idiom, and to some persons does not convey a distinct idea." We are compelled to dissent from this; and in our opinion he has enfeebled a plain and striking expression, by translating it, as he has: — "mere vanity." We ought in justice, however, to add, that he himself "had some hesitation in regard to substituting this phrase for the well-known" one. We wish we had more such Hebraisms. There is a charm about them. We would restore them in some cases even where King James's divines, as well as Professor Noyes, have failed to represent them. That passage of Jonah, for example, — in the last verse but one of the book, — which says of the gourd, that it "came up in a night and perished in a night," would sound more agreeably to our ears, if rendered, as it might be: — "as son of a night it arose, and as son of a night vanished." There is a certain poetical effect, that is worth securing when we can fairly come by it. Who would be satisfied with the turning of Homer's "sons of the Greeks" into "Grecians;" or Moses' "Children of Israel" into "Israelites?" Again, at Ecclesiastes xi. 10: "childhood and youth are vanity." The original is, "*youth and the morning;*" which is a much finer expression. It is true that the morning is only a poetical image of young life; but it is a beautiful image, and ought to have been preserved. We grant, however, that these are mere questions of taste, and ours perhaps is too partially inclined towards the antique and the strong. We must mention, however, before we close, as an instance of unnecessary and unfortunate departure from the received version, the whole passage in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, from the first to the tenth verse. We do not think that it was in any need of critical assistance. It is much more terse and elegant in the form to which we have been accustomed. The reason for the change, assigned in the note, does not seem to us satisfactory; and could never reconcile us to give up the simple phrase, "a time to break down and a time to build up," for so uncouth a one as, "breaking down has its time, and its time building up."

That the "time" here repeatedly spoken of is that of God's appointment, and not of man's choosing, seems manifest enough from the opening sentence: "a time to be born, and a time to die." We see here no ambiguity that needed to be guarded against.

We now take leave of these biblical translations, a completed series of six volumes, with our sincere thanks to the writer for the favor that he has thus done the public. And when we say the public, we mean the public. Some may suppose that these books are only designed for the use of students and learned men. We assure them that it is not so. They are for all reading and thoughtful persons. Christians in general should take an interest in them. They will find them valuable helps to the understanding and appreciation of these precious remains of sacred antiquity. Who does not read the Bible? And who that has a thoroughly awakened desire to learn what it contains, might not wisely avail himself of the services of so safe and able an instructer? The Latin and Greek may be left to those who understand it. If there is anything too nice in criticism, or too profound in investigation, it may be passed over by all who take no pleasure in such inquiries. But all this together makes but a very small part of the contents of these volumes. The rest is for everybody, who loves to look into the records of the religion and commonwealth of the most remarkable people on the face of the earth; to trace in the predictions of a former faith the foreshadowing of his own; or even but to entertain and kindle his mind with the most fervid strains of poetic inspiration that the world has ever listened to. We hope, therefore, to see the whole course, — and especially that new edition of the Psalms which we are eagerly expecting, — in the smallest libraries and upon parlor tables. The books are sightly, and of a convenient size and arrangement for the most common reference. They are encumbered as little as possible with what any one can consider superfluous. They are as compact as their fulness of thought admits of, and as easy as anything that professes to require study need or can be. We can only express the wish, that in the future editions of the Psalms and the Prophets the translator may greatly increase the number of his annotations.

Dr. Noyes has begun in the right place, — with the

poetic, prophetic and didactic parts of the Old Testament. We wish that he may be so encouraged by the reception of these, as to proceed now to put his hand to the historical portions. The Pentateuch would furnish a suitable subject for his scholar-like industry. N. L. F.

ART. IX. — REV. JOHN BRAZER, D. D.

DIED, at the house of his friend and class-mate, Dr. Benjamin Huger, of South Carolina, on the twenty-sixth of Feburary, 1846, Rev. John Brazer, D. D. of Salem, in the fifty-seventh year of his age.

He was born in Worcester, September 21, 1789. For a time he was employed in a mercantile house in Boston, but his tastes led him into widely different pursuits, and he was graduated at Harvard College, with the highest honors of his class, in 1813. In 1815 he was appointed Tutor, and in 1817 Professor of Latin in Harvard College, where he continued about five years. On Tuesday, November 14, 1820, he was ordained Pastor of the North Society in Salem, in which place he continued till his death, more than a quarter of a century. From an article in the Salem Gazette we learn, that "he was the third pastor of that society. Rev. Dr. Barnard, the first minister, having been ordained January 13, 1773, continued his pastoral relation there till his sudden and lamented death, October 1, 1814. The gifted and pious Abbot succeeded him, and was ordained on the twentieth of the April following. He died October 7, 1819, after a lingering illness of upwards of two years. Thus the pastoral office has been vacant but twenty months, from the first settlement to the present time, a period of more than seventy-three years."

Dr. Brazer held always a prominent place in the community where he resided, and among the members of his own profession. Judge Story, Judge Putnam, Col. Benjamin Pickman, and Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, were among the parishioners who entertained a high opinion of his talents, and the late Dr. Bowditch, though never a parishioner, left him at his death a small legacy as a token of his

confidence and respect. He was for several years Secretary of the Bible Society of Salem and vicinity, and a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was also a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University, from which institution he received the degree of S. T. D. in 1836.

We have always supposed that Dr. Brazer was one of the most accurate of our classical scholars. He was a hard student, and a diligent and successful one. Two articles on Cemeteries, one in the Christian Examiner and the other in the North American Review, and an article on Mill's Logic in a recent number of the latter journal, show how far and how thoroughly he sometimes pursued studies which lie only upon the borders of his profession.

As a theologian, he was clear, systematic, and exact. A series of discourses which he gave on the Atonement, we have heard spoken of by one competent to judge, as a most complete and satisfactory elucidation of that difficult subject. He spared no pains to make himself master of what he wished to teach; and never in his writings permitted himself to go beyond the bounds of his knowledge. His attainments, therefore, were uncommon in extent, and still more so in the distinctness with which they were brought out. His theological views were clear and precisely defined, indicating more the laborious scholar and exact reasoner than the profound and original thinker.

The efficacy of prayer and the influence of the Divine spirit, were always with him favorite topics. He longed earnestly, as a great want of his nature, for the strength which can thus alone be given to us in our weakness, and the encouragement which in our despondency we can receive only from God. In 1832 he published a tract on Prayer, which may be read with profit by those who have philosophical doubts on the subject. In 1835 he published quite an extended treatise on Divine Influence, which may serve as an exhibition of his powers as a writer. The subject is minutely and exactly reasoned out; objections are sought, examined, and refuted; the true doctrine defined and established; the abuses, to which it is liable, pointed out and guarded against; and all this is done so thoroughly, that, if the spirit of prayer and devout reliance be not quickened within us, we are at least well informed upon

the subject, our intellectual scruples are silenced, while the reasonableness and advantage of faith in the ever present and sustaining presence of God are clearly understood.

A single paragraph we subjoin, not only to show Dr. Brazer's power as a writer, but to afford some slight idea of his own spiritual experience and insight.

"As another proof of the reality of God's presence to the human soul, we add, in conclusion, that of Experience. We speak here of no mystical influence, but of one which is clear, distinct, rational, and matter of habitual consciousness with the truly pious spirit. It is a religious peace; a holy joy in God, in His Son, and in the revelations of His will, that no words can adequately express. The soul, thus visited from on high, will perceive, that Christian truth is to all its capacities like light to the eye, each being made for the other; that the revelation of the Gospel is but the enlargement and confirmation of all other truth; that it interprets all the secrets of our mysterious nature; meets all its inner wants; answers to all its higher aspirations; solves all the dark problems of Providence; presents a noble aim to life; gives an all-concerning significance to human conduct; relieves the mind from the anguish of uncertainty respecting the future, from the distress of conflicting passions, from the solicitations of bad desire, from the opposition between duty and feeling, from the stings of remorse, and all the sad requitals of an outraged and hostile conscience. The spirit, thus touched of God, experiences what is emphatically called in the Scriptures a "joy in believing." It opens, continually, to new displays of His exhaustless love; perceives, more and more clearly, His stupendous plan of grace in the salvation of man; attains a blessed consciousness of thinking worthily and acting well; and gains more and more of that temper of our Divine Master, which elevates, tranquilizes, amends, and hallows the life. In every dark hour, its language will be, as it has been, 'O what a power there is in the Infinite Mind of Deity, to communicate itself to the soul that looks singly to Him for comfort and support! The greater the exigence, the more perfect the adaptation; the more troubled the sea is around us, the more we feel the security and firmness of our hold upon the Rock of Ages!' In a word, the spirit, thus guided from above, will experience, more and more, that the Saviour's parting promise of 'peace' to his immediate disciples is not confined to them, but is fulfilled to his faithful followers now; that it is, indeed, '*his* peace;' that it is given, in very truth, '*not* as the world giveth;' that it adds to every token of Divine Beneficence some relishes of heavenly blessedness; makes the whole creation one august temple for praise; renders life one continued offering of

love and homage; and clothes every event, even while it is 'seen and temporal,' with the sublimer wisdom of 'things unseen and eternal.'" — pp. 142 – 144.

These same qualities which we have noticed, marked his preaching, which was, we should say, peculiarly intellectual and moral, — appealing more to the reason and conscience, than to the delicate sensibilities of our nature and those vague, but powerful emotions, which reach out towards the infinite and eternal. He was no dealer in paradoxes or startling assertions, but presented the great doctrines of Christian truth with the limitations and qualifications which must necessarily belong to them in their manifold applications. He was bold to rebuke the fashionable sins and follies of the day, but may not have been equally skilled in reaching the affections of his hearers, and through all their tender sympathies winning and binding them to Christ. Religion was perhaps with him more a life of severe and solemn duties, than a delightful offering of the soul to God, enjoining acts of painful self-denial, but cheered by hopes and promises, by inward joys and silent thoughts, the dearest and most inspiring that man can know.

Few ministers have been so faithful and laborious in their preparations for the pulpit; and few have been in the habit of giving discourses so elaborate and thoroughly finished. He used to say, that he never began upon a new discourse without trying to make it a better sermon than he had ever written before, and that he seldom went into the pulpit without feeling that in the study he had done the best that it was in his power to do. His published writings bear marks of this same elaborate care. The discourse which he preached after the death of Dr. Holyoke is, in its literary execution, in the fidelity and exactness of its delineations, and the tone of feeling that runs through it, almost a model for that species of composition.

Dr. Brazer's later discourses on Col. Pickman and Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, parishioners such as it is the misfortune of few ministers to lose or their privilege to have, are distinguished for their severe fidelity and discriminating acuteness. They contain nothing that savors of the unmeaning eulogy, which so often impairs our confidence in what are called funeral sermons. Indeed we should rather object to them, that they are too much a sharp intellectual

analysis, and have too little to soothe the feelings of bereaved affection through the ministrations of a divine consolation. But the measure which he meted to others, he asked for himself. A short time before his departure for the South, talking with the brother who has since preached his funeral discourse, in allusion to the possible occurrence of such an event, he said with earnestness, "Let there be no panegyric."

As a pastor, Dr. Brazer was particularly attentive to the destitute, the sick and the afflicted. "To you," he said, "who are prosperous and happy, it is of little consequence whether I come or not." But there are those who remember how constant and how thoughtful he was in his attentions to them through long and wearisome weeks or months of sickness, though he may seldom have visited them at other times. And the poor he did not neglect, but, as the almoner of a wealthy and generous society, was always faithful to them. In one of his last letters to his family he enjoined it upon them, to "remember his poor." "Remember the poor!" How much of that charity, which covereth the multitude of sins, is contained in these words, and how at his death do our feelings warm and soften towards him who has been true to their meaning. "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; naked, and ye clothed me. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." There is no part of a minister's life on which at its close he may look back with richer satisfaction.

Dr. Brazer had been most happy in the nearest of domestic relations, and the death of his wife, in February, 1843, was a blow from which, in the opinion of those who knew him best, he never entirely recovered. From that time he suffered severely from what after his death was found to be an organic affection of the heart, till early this last winter, when it was often only with extreme difficulty, that he could go through with the labors of the Sabbath. The last sermon which he preached to his own people — in the same pulpit from which Dr. Greenwood preached for the last time — was on the first Sunday in the year, from the words, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap;" and was spoken of at the time by those who heard

it, as the most touching and impressive sermon that he had ever delivered, — as pervaded by a spirit of tenderness altogether beyond what was usual in his public services. He was evidently laboring under great physical debility; but the extent and character of his disease were not even suspected by his friends.

Soon after, as soon as the state of his health and his wishes were known by his people, they gave him leave of absence for a few months and supplied him with the means of defraying his expenses during a journey to the South. He left home, accompanied by his son, on the nineteenth of January, and seemed at once greatly relieved. He enjoyed the journey, spent a few days in Washington, took a lively interest in seeing whatever was to be seen, and arrived at Charleston, S. C., apparently much better than when he sat out from home. He received from Dr. Huger and his family every attention which might contribute to his happiness or comfort, and thought himself more entirely free from sickness then he had been for several years. He rode out on the afternoon of Tuesday, February 24; but on his return in the evening was taken violently ill, and lingered, for the most part in a state of insensibility, till Thursday morning, when he was quietly released from a body, which through life had been the source of more and severer trials than fall often to the lot of man.

The news of Dr. Brazer's death came upon his friends with a suddenness almost startling. The latest accounts received from him had been of the most encouraging character, when the same mail which announced his sudden and severe illness brought also the tidings of his death, and the tolling of the bell was the first intimation which most of his parishioners had, that he was not still improving in his health. The Sunday after the sad intelligence was received, his church was closed, and on the following Sabbath a very impressive funeral discourse was delivered by Rev. Dr. Flint from the words, "Though dead, he yet speaketh." And so another from among those who have held a high place as a minister of our faith shall speak to us in time to come only by the words which he has already uttered, by the life which he has lived, and the many solemn thoughts and emotions suggested by his death.

J. H. M.

ART. X. — OLIVER CROMWELL — PURITANISM.*

IT is a noteworthy fact, that so many gifted and leading minds in our time have been moved to do some justice to the Puritans. Mr. Macauley, in a brilliant essay of his youth, of which, we are sorry to add, he has lived to be somewhat impatient in more mature years, taught the reading world here, if not on the other side of the water, to be ashamed that they were ashamed of the Puritans. James Grahame, an honest, diligent, accurate Scotsman, fell passionately in love with the history of this country, chiefly on account of the religious principles of its early settlers. He devoted his pure and useful life, with a quiet enthusiasm, to the work he had taken in hand. Guizot, who stands at the right hand of the ablest monarch in Europe or the world, finds time amidst the cares of his high position, to study the event to which the Protestant Puritans in England gave the impulse, and which he with reason calls "stupendous." And now Mr. Carlyle brings his vigorous and peculiar intellect to grasp the same great theme. We have before us two works, relating to the same period of English history, the heroic age of England, according to Carlyle, and certainly to us Cis-Atlantic readers by far the most interesting and important period from Saxon Alfred to Victoria.

The work of the distinguished Frenchman, the title of which we have given, treats of the First of the Three Parts into which he divides the History of the English Revolution of 1640. It occupies the space that lies between the accession of Charles I. in 1625 and his death in 1649, when the elements of strife in the nation were arranging themselves round their respective centres; when the minds of men were growing more and more ardent; when the storm was brewing, which at length burst forth, and resulted in the ruin of the throne and of him who sat upon

* 1. *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, with Elucidations.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. In two volumes. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 8vo. pp. 560, and 437.

2. *History of the English Revolution of* 1640, *commonly called the Great Rebellion: from the accession of Charles I. to his death.* By F. GUIZOT, the Prime Minister of France. Translated by William Hazlitt. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 515.

it by a *divine right*. The Second Period starts from the death of Charles (the martyr — as the toad-eating Histories of England, written by Churchmen, placemen, or infidel tories call him) and includes the acts of the Long Parliament and the career of Cromwell. During this period the nation was making desperate efforts to get itself "settled," in which efforts the sword of the Lord and of Oliver finally prevailed, and the Commonwealth was erected and kept in poise so long as the mailed saint continued to live. "The Third Period" to use Guizot's own words, "is that of monarchical reaction, successful for a while under Charles II., who in his cautious selfishness aimed at nothing beyond his own personal enjoyment, but ruined by the blind passion of James II., who aimed at absolute power. In 1688 England achieved the point she aimed at in 1640, and quitted the career of revolution for that of liberty."

Only the First Part of this comprehensive plan, sketched by the Prime Minister of France, has been as yet completed, and given to the world in the work we are noticing. "I have collected," he remarks, "for the history of the two other periods, a body of materials which, as I believe, are neither without importance or variety. A day will doubtless come, when I shall be able to make use of these materials: meantime, wanting the leisure to complete my narrative of this stupendous event, I apply my mind, at every available moment, to its just comprehension." It was the opinion of Napoleon, that history should be written, not by cloistered scholars, mere word-mongers, but by practical men, by statesmen, by generals, by men familiar with the actual working of the social machinery. And this accords very much with Lord Bacon's sentiment, when he says, that "generally it were to be wished as that which would make learning indeed solid and fruitful, that active men would or could" (Napoleon left out the *could*) "become writers." The Prime Minister of France possesses this qualification; he is a statesman and a scholar. And the analogies of the French Revolution help to give his mind a lively interest in the "Grand Rebellion," as it has been too long insolently labelled in the pattern Histories of England.

We infer from certain hints and suggestions in the work of Mr. Carlyle before us, that he too has entertained the design of writing a History of the same period. "One

wishes," he says, "there were a History of English Puritanism, the last of all our Heroisms; but sees small prospect of such a thing at present." In the meantime, and as an earnest of something more to come, we welcome this collection of Cromwell's writings, with the elucidations of Thomas Carlyle. The work commences with an Introduction, quite characteristic, divided into five chapters, in which we have remarks upon the general subject of Puritanism, and upon the manner in which the history of the seventeenth century has been usually treated; notices of the several biographies that have been written of Oliver Cromwell; an account of the Cromwell kindred; a series of events arranged chronologically from the birth of Oliver up to the date of his first letter; and lastly, remarks upon the letters and speeches. Then follow the Letters and Speeches themselves, divided into ten parts, corresponding to as many periods in the life of their author. The writings of Cromwell, tied up in these chronological bundles, are prefaced and accompanied by Elucidations, in the peculiar fashion of the editor, in which are blended acuteness, wisdom, pathos, eloquence, drollery and sarcasm.

It is a favorite notion with Mr. Carlyle, that the seventeenth century is inaccessible to the men of the present day, by reason of the lack of faith now, and the consequent inability to conceive of the convictions that governed men then.

"The Christian doctrines, which then dwelt alive in every heart, have now in a manner died out of all hearts — very mournful to behold; and are not the guidance of this world any more. Nay, worse still, the cant of them does yet dwell alive with us, little doubting that it is cant; — in which fatal intermediate state the eternal sacredness of this universe itself, of this human life itself, has fallen dark to the most of us, and we think that too a cant and a creed. Thus the old names suggest new things to us, — not august and divine, but hypocritical, pitiable, detestable. The old names and similitudes of belief still circulate from tongue to tongue, though now in such a ghastly condition, not as commandments of the living God, which we must do or perish eternally, alas, no, as something very different from that! Here properly lies the grand unintelligibility of the seventeenth century for us." — Vol. I. p. 6.

It would be difficult, well-nigh impossible, to instance the individual, about whom more lies have been told, and

towards whom more injustice has been done, than in the case of Oliver Cromwell. There is a numerous class of erroneous historical judgments, which take possession of men's minds, and when they get possession, are handed down from one generation to another. Like the books which Charles Lamb says are expected to belong to every gentleman's library, (Hume's England, if we mistake not, was one of the books mentioned by him,) so they are expected, as a matter of course, to form part of the furniture or fixtures of every gentleman's noddle. Many of these erroneous opinions are quite unsubstantial, and are easily scattered, a host of them at once, whenever a true thinker appears and speaks. These resemble very much the little cherubs, only the upper parts of which existed, or whose posterior continuations were cloud-hidden, that kept flitting about St. Cecilia in one of her musical ecstacies. "Sit down — sit down," cried the saint. "Thank you, Madam, we have not the wherewithal to accept your invitation."

There are other less airy, more stubbornly rooted prejudices, founded in malice and stupidity. We are pleased with the manner in which Mr. Carlyle deals with such of these malignant and stupid calumnies as he thinks deserving of his notice. In one of the earliest of Cromwell's letters that have been preserved, he uses such expressions as were then, and still are, common with a certain class of religious persons, to describe his great sinfulness before his conversion, and the wonderful change wrought in him by religious convictions. "You know," he says, writing to his cousin, "what my manner of life hath been. Oh, I lived in and loved darkness, and hated light. I was a chief, the chief of sinners etc." Noble, one of Oliver's biographers, remarks, that he finds in these expressions "clear evidence that Oliver was once a very dissolute man." Carlyle thus deals with his "reverend imbecile friend, Noble:" —

"Brother, hadst thou never, in any form, such moments in thy history? Thou knowest them not, even by credible rumor? Well, thy earthly path was peaceabler, I suppose; but the highest was never in thee; the highest will never come out of thee. Thou shalt at best abide by the stuff; as cherished house-dog, guard the stuff, — perhaps with enormous gold collars and provender; but the battle, and the hero death, and victory's fire-chariot carrying men to the Immortals, shall never be thine. I

pity thee; brag not, or I shall have to despise thee." — Vol. I. pp. 98–100.

Numerous other instances might be adduced, were there space, of the manner in which the memory of Cromwell has been abused. Ever since Charles II. ordered the bodies of a multitude of dead Puritans, Oliver's mother among the rest, to be dug up and thrown in a heap in St. Margaret's church yard, and the dead body of the Protector to swing upon a gallows at Tyburn, those who have written the biography of the arch-regicide have taken their cue from the court, and the villifiers of Oliver have had the field pretty much to themselves for two centuries. But truth must be heard at last. There is among *us*, certainly, no court-interest to serve by lying sycophants; and we may venture to expect that Oliver Cromwell will yet shine out the diamond that he is, when the filth that is thick upon his name and character shall be known by men not to be inherent, but to have been left there by the dirty tread of the harpies that have trampled on him.

It is the remark of Hume, speaking of Cromwell's conference with a Committee of the Parliament, on the subject of his assuming the office and title of King, that "he was incapable of expressing himself on this occasion, but in a manner which a peasant of the most ordinary capacity would justly be ashamed of." And in a note the historian adds, "The great defect in Oliver's speeches consists not in his want of elocution, but in his want of ideas. — The collection of all his speeches, letters, sermons, (for he also wrote sermons) would make a great curiosity, and, with a few exceptions, might justly pass for one of the most nonsensical books in the world."

Indeed, Mr. Hume! Well, here they are, Letters and Speeches, (no sermons, — but we can imagine what they would be from the specimens before us,) and the world can judge at length whether Mr. Hume is correct. "The great defect in Oliver's speeches, not want of elocution, but want of ideas!" But how does this square with the charge of hypocrisy? The opinion which commonly prevails in the world, and which Historian Hume is quite ready to adopt, is that Cromwell was enough of a knave and dissembler to use words to conceal his ideas; — that he had ideas enough, but they were so bad that he was forced to veil

them under a confused jargon. We may venture to assert that there were some ideas in Oliver's mind, expressed too in good solid Saxon phraseology in his letters and speeches, which are none the less important because they were not "dreamt of in your philosophy," Mr. Hume; ideas, that have too much faded out of the minds of most men, that might without injury to the world be revived in men's minds. "I called these Letters good," says Carlyle in his Introduction, "but withal only good of their kind. No eloquence, elegance, not always even clearness of expression, is to be looked for in them. They are written with far other than literary aims; written, most of them, in the very flame and conflagration of a revolutionary struggle, and with an eye to the despatch of indispensable business alone; but it will be found, I conceive, that for such end they are well written." To turn from the witty, brilliant, heartless, trifling letters of such a man as Horace Walpole, for example, to the involved, clumsily jointed sentences, and obsolete diction of Oliver the Puritan, — who has, as any one may see, always a good strong meaning in him, worthy of being worked into shape, although he understands very little of the art of shaping human meanings (commonly known as a *fine* art,) — is to us a refreshment of spirit.

Oliver Cromwell united the two chief elements of power among men, — physical valor and deep religious conviction, — the power of the sword and the moral power of faith. And here in this connexion we would venture to express the opinion, that the attempt to explain the Lord Protector's character on the supposition of *hypocrisy*, which is so generally resorted to, fails entirely. It is not sufficient to explain philosophically the unquestioned facts of his case. It is no easier a matter, surely, to make a baseless pretension to faith and piety answer as a sufficient substitute for sincere, real conviction, than it would be to make a windy braggardism an equivalent for true courage and heroism. Had Cromwell been the hypocrite he is accused of being, he never could have achieved what he did achieve. Hypocrisy and hollowness are not springs of moral energy. Nothing can come of nothing. A character like his could have grown only out of some deep, genuine principle, or passion, or conviction of his own. Whether true or false, right or wrong, there must have been at bottom something

sincere, real, his own. He was great not merely by wielding the passions of others, but because he shared the passions of his time; the ideas of the age were his own ideas. His own soul was possessed and vivified and inflamed by the convictions of his contemporaries. He was a Puritan himself, and not merely a leader and adroit manager of Puritans. He believed in what he undertook to advocate. This is our theory of his character. And we think this view cannot but be adopted by many, if they will take the trouble to read Oliver's own utterances, as edited, arranged and elucidated by Thomas Carlyle.

Cromwell's occasional levity and buffoonery even on the most serious occasions, instances of which are so frequently produced in proof of his hypocrisy, do not, in our view, necessarily involve the conclusion, that he was insincere when he assumed the manner and made use of the dialect of the religious of that day. These phases of his character, to our apprehension, only indicate the reaction of a mind naturally sensitive, serious, conscientious, even morbidly gloomy and profound in its questionings. Cromwell is known to have been a hypochondriac. He had seasons of appalling depression, when the cloud covered his mind and shut out all cheerful visions. The law which governs such minds, varying their moods and frames from one extreme to another, is familiar. Oliver's exuberant spirits on certain grave occasions are proof to us of the deep concern and profound agitation which had shaken his mind previously. We are not made acquainted with the fears and doubts which his soul had wrestled with in secret. All *that* remains undisclosed to mortals, — the part of his biography which will never be written. We see only the banter and jest, the grotesque acts and fantastic tricks with which he sought, not unlikely, to shake off the gloom, and to tear himself from the demon that held his mind in darkness.

The royal moralist in Scripture declares, that there is "a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance;" — and we may say, in accordance with this doctrine, that in a healthy mind the various and opposite moods of grave and gay, cheerful and serious, lively and solemn, alternate and succeed each other, in the order which the God who made our frame designed. And whenever this natural order and succession of moods is broken

up and interrupted from any cause, nature dictates to the mind to struggle to regain the balance. If there has been too profound and too continued melancholy, the individual struggles to throw off the oppression, and in so doing is very likely to exceed the bounds of a decorous cheerfulness, and to give way to an extravagant, perhaps an unseemly mirth and gaiety ; and if, in the efforts which he makes to throw off his fixed uniformity of feeling, the individual fail of success, and the mind, in spite of all struggles, will remain fixed in one unvarying mood, whether that mood be lively or melancholy, there is derangement, insanity, a morbid condition of mind.

It is well known to those conversant with literary history, that some of the most humorous, laughter-moving compositions that any language contains, have been produced when their authors were writhing under the most intense mental anguish, or enveloped in the folds of the most appalling melancholy. Dean Swift, indulging in gay banter, and crying 'vive la bagatelle', while at the same time he was gnashing his teeth inwardly with morose rage, and Cowper, penning the humorous ballad of John Gilpin, while he was oppressed with the cloud of religious madness that had settled down hopelessly upon his mind, are familiar instances that will readily occur to the reader in illustration of the remark just made. The great dramatic poet of our language also, who reflects from his varied pages all the phases of human life, and all the diversified aspects of human nature, both in its sane and in its distempered conditions, exhibits the same mysterious fact and mental law, in the character of his Hamlet. The Prince is made acquainted, through preternatural means, as the poet imagines, with the crime by which his lamented father had been foully murdered by him who now occupies his throne and bed. This dreadful secret the poet supposes to have been communicated to a young, ardent, susceptible, cultivated, reflecting mind, and the solemn injunction to be laid upon an educated conscience, to avenge the deed. Hamlet bears about with him the oppressive secret. It haunts him by day and by night. He is not permitted to communicate the secret to another, and thus to gain composure to his troubled spirit. He has no peers with whom he can share his domestic troubles. Had Hamlet been a mere creature

of impulse and passion, the knowledge of the crime would have been immediately and precipitately followed by revenge. This would have been a very simple state of mind, easily depicted by a common artist. But the character which Shakspeare undertook to draw, was far more complicated. He was not a being of mere impulse and passion. He had a reflecting, philosophical cast of mind. And the crime, of which he had been informed, instead of merely inflaming him with hatred towards the guilty author of the crime, and driving him with headlong haste and fury upon the object of his hatred, detained him, — not through cowardice, but in accordance with some of the prominent elements of his peculiar mind, — detained him — held him back awhile from the performance of the act to which he was constantly prompted, and engaged his musing, contemplative spirit upon the deepest mysteries of man's being, nature, and condition. His mind's attention was fixed upon whatever is most perplexing in human life without, and in that little world in man's breast, where the patterns of all crimes and of all virtues are first designed and sketched, before they are actualized in life. This concentrated attention, this intense action of a mind conversing too much with itself, now plunging into the deepest abysses of thought, and now soaring, on the wings of imagination, to heights where the air would be too thin and subtile to sustain life, this continued melancholy needed — demanded some relief. The ordinary succession of cheerful and grave images and moods, which constitutes the condition of a sound mind, was in his case broken up; and in his struggles to recover this natural state, he is represented by the poet, with the greatest truth, and with marvellous art, as bearing himself strangely and oddly; he "puts an antic disposition on;" he indulges in fantastic humors; his black melancholy is fringed with playful fancies; he laughs and jests even while his heart is ready to crack and burst with suppressed, uncommunicated grief. All this is most true to nature. It was an assumed madness, say the critics. But he could not avoid assuming it; it was just what nature prompted, — drove him to — for relief. One string had been so long played upon, that another must be struck. It was with him as with Solomon, "he gave his heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly" too.

But Cromwell was an ambitious usurper, "guilty of his country's blood," — is another charge! And yet he was not blood-thirsty. He fought not as if it were his trade. He girded himself for the fight, not under the impulse of youthful passion, nor to make his fortune in the world. He was in middle life when the great conflict of arms began in England. He was the father, and the affectionate father, of a large family of children. He had long since worked off the fervors of youth and early manhood. He had pursued for years the quiet labors of husbandry on the banks of the Ouse. He put on the harness at the mature age of three and forty, influenced by a strong conviction of duty, believing that he was fighting the battles of the living God. He effected an entire change in the character of the army. It was said of Cromwell's soldiers, "Not a man swears but he pays his twelve-pence; no plundering, no drinking, disorder or impiety allowed." He says in one of his letters to the Parliament from Ireland, during his campaign in that distracted island, "We serve you; we are willing to be out of our trade of war, and shall hasten, by God's assistance and grace, to the end of our work, as the laborer doth to be at his rest." The notion of John Milton was, "that the Protectorate of his Highness Oliver was a thing called for by the necessities and the everlasting laws." And even Hume allows that, if he had "been guilty of no crime but this temporary usurpation, the plea of necessity and public good, which he alleged, might be allowed, in every view, a reasonable excuse for his conduct."

"I have lived," said Cromwell, in one of his speeches, "the latter part of my age in — if I may say so — the fire; in the midst of troubles." "I can say, in the presence of God, in comparison with whom we are but like poor creeping ants upon the earth, I would have been glad to have lived under my wood-side, to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than undertaken such a government as this." It requires no uncommon measure of faith to credit this. It was no easy seat that he sat upon. To act the part of constable, and preserve the peace in three such nations as England, Scotland and Ireland then were; to subdue and to keep down so many factions as then existed; to guard against so many personal enemies at home and abroad; to satisfy the public mind teeming with so many wild theories

of religion and government; — to do all this was not easy. It *would* have been better, so far as his own happiness was concerned, "to have kept a flock of sheep."

And if it is once granted that he was justified by necessity in assuming supreme power, it will not be questioned by any that his government was vigorous, successful, glorious. England was never better governed, it will probably be conceded by all, than in the days of Cromwell. He made the name of his country to be respected and dreaded in every part of the globe. The helm was in the hand of a sharp-sighted pilot, who knew how to steer the ship of state through as boisterous a storm as England has ever been tossed by. He adopted and acted on the principle of toleration in religion, at a time when toleration was generally viewed as nothing better than a criminal indifference to God's truth. He made it the noble aim of his foreign policy, to unite all the Protestant nations of Europe, under the lead of the Commonwealth, against Popery. In the midst of his own perplexing affairs, he had an open ear and a sympathizing heart for the sufferings of the persecuted Protestants abroad, and he interposed effectually in their behalf. He was served by such men as Blake upon the ocean, and Matthew Hale upon the bench, and John Milton in the office of Secretary. Such are among the features of the Protector's government, justifying the splendid praise of the author of Paradise Lost in his well known sonnet.

It pleased the Lord, in his Providence, to take him away before he had realized all his great ideas in Church and State; and Charles Stuart, the Second, with his pimps and mistresses, "Nell-Gwynn Defender of the faith," the father — (of his people? not he) — of the English nobility, came in, and the compact strength and Christian decency of the Commonwealth disappeared. Who now will venture to praise the man that was recently so flattered? See the cringing, time-serving crowds sloping off and turning round, as soon as that eye, which would have awed them to the dust, is closed, and saluting the royal Charles, who returns, with all his father's high notions of authority and with none of his father's personal virtues, to bring back the double curse of a licentious court and a petticoat prelacy. See poets of transcendant genius, Dryden and Waller, (Milton, thank God! was not with them,) crooking the

hinges of their supple knees to the rising sun; eating their own words; and applauding him who, with a generosity worthy of the Stuarts, could dig up the relics of the dead lion, that he might have the satisfaction of kicking, with his ass's hoof, the leader, before whose face had fled in dismay the broken squadrons of the royal host at Worcester.

But the murder of the King — how, it is asked, shall that stain be wiped off from Oliver Cromwell's name?

He sat, as is well known of all men, in the High Court of Justice before which King Charles I. was brought to trial; he consented to the sentence passed upon that unfortunate monarch; and his name appears among others affixed to the death-warrant.

"In the drama of modern history," Mr. Carlyle remarks, "one knows not any graver, more note-worthy scene; — earnest as very Death and Judgment." * * * "They have decided to have justice, these men; to see God's justice done, and his judgments executed on this earth." * * * "We know it not, this atrocity of the English Regicides, shall never know it. I reckon it perhaps the most daring action any body of men, to be met with in history, ever, with clear consciousness, deliberately set themselves to do. Dread phantoms, glaring supernal on you — when once they are quelled and their light snuffed out — none knows the terror of the phantom." * * * "The like of which action will not be needed for a thousand years again. Needed, alas, — not till a new genuine hero-worship has arisen, has perfected itself, and had time to degenerate into a Flunkeyism and cloth-worship again! Which I take to be a very long date indeed!" — Vol. I. pp. 325 — 330.

Affairs had got into such a position, that the nation could be settled, and the peace and prosperity of England be secured, only by the entire overthrow of one or other of the opposite parties. The king represented one of those parties in his own person; so much so, that if he were removed, his party and cause were destroyed. There was, of course, no one person on the popular side, who in any such sense represented his party, and therefore to make sure of the destruction of this side, a great many must be sacrificed. So that on the score of common humanity and simple equity, which is the only rule for Christian Republicans to adopt in forming their judgment upon this act, it was far preferable that one man should die for the peace of a nation, than that the civil strife should be indefinitely

prolonged. Whether Oliver Cromwell and his associate regicides really governed themselves, in the act to which they consented, by such a pure and simple motive, without any mixture of malice, revenge, ambition, envy, rapacity and self-seeking, and how far, if at all, each or any of them was thus influenced, are questions above human fallibility to decide. To their own Master they must stand or fall. But the act is sufficiently justified historically by the simple course of reasoning which we have indicated.

The very same principles that brought our ancestors hither, and upon which all that we value is based, brought Charles Stuart to the block, and made him in the midst of his days a headless trunk. Charles was in many respects a good man. He had commendable qualities. He was, we cannot doubt, perfectly sincere in believing that the world was made, by the Lord of the universe, to be governed by Kings. He bore himself firmly, with calm dignity, to the end. He died as a Christian should die. There was nothing on his conscience to trouble him except the blood of Strafford. Strafford was the only one of his friends whom he had had the timidity to forsake. The account of the closing scenes of this monarch's life, as given by Hume, deeply interests the reader, and awakens respect and compassion towards the royal sufferer. But the ideas which he had inherited from his royal ancestors, and which he held so tenaciously, came into collision with the new ideas of the age. The two forces could not, or would not turn aside to pass each other. Neither would or could turn round, that they might pursue together the same track. There could be progress only in one way. One of the parties or the other must pass over the dead body of its antagonist. "The king of England, with his chief priests, was going one way; the Nation of England, by eternal laws, was going another; the split became too wide for healing." And it was for some time doubtful, whether the king or his enemies would finally prevail. Till his head was in the hands of the executioner, and his blood on the handkerchiefs of the people, it was uncertain, — and the Independents knew this quite well, — which party should finally be uppermost in the conflict. "History, which has wept for a misguided Charles Stuart, and blubbered, in the most copious, helpless manner, near two

centuries now, whole floods of brine, enough to salt the Herring fishery," and in the intervals of blubbering has uttered through the nose a maledictory interjection against the fanatical Independents, the miscreant Regicides, has no whine to suspire over the multitude of poor obscure victims that Laud and such as he, cut-throats by the grace of God, sent to the shades, or that larger multitude of trembling heretics upon whom dominant and persecuting Presbyterianism was ready to fasten its fangs.

But the defence of Cromwell's character from the charges which stupidity and malignity have brought against him, although important, is not, after all, of chief importance. Neither his, nor any man's character will bear indiscriminate eulogy, or deserves indiscriminate censure. He was only one item in a vast social account, one individual in a great social movement, more prominent certainly than others, — a Leader, as mortals call one another. But in the great Epic of Providence, *leaders* should be printed with a small initial. Under the great monarchy of the Lord, leaders are only poor subalterns, pigmy agents, raised up to utter the word, "thus saith the Lord," and dashed in pieces, whenever in their pitiful pride they stand against the divine world-movement.

It is not Oliver Cromwell alone, that suffers injustice at the hands of the English Toryarchy. No. It is the whole movement in the latter part of the sixteenth and through the first half of the seventeenth centuries, that is lashed across the Protector's shoulders. It is we, the rightful heirs of Puritanism, who are insulted and defamed in the person of him who was the strongest man in that battle of humanity. What we would insist on strenuously is, that we of New England, who are shoots from that old Puritan stock, should be especially careful not to allow our minds to be controlled on this subject by writers, all whose interests and biasses incline them to take an opposite view from ours of that old drama and its persons. We are the fruit of the same seed that produced the Commonwealth in England. In the land of our fathers the great cause of civil and religious liberty was overborne, trampled down and speedily ruined, and the royal game-cocks crowed lustily over the *annus mirabilis*, the glorious Restoration, forsooth. But in America the cause was safe by reason of the

obscurity of the wilderness. Here it grew and flourished noiselessly; and the Commonwealth of England finds its counterpart, and the ideas of the English Puritans are realized, in the associated commonwealths that cluster here, from one ocean to another, round the same republican empire.

We welcome this book of Carlyle's, because we think that the public mind in this country is occupied with entirely false ideas and judgments in regard to the period of English history to which Oliver Cromwell belongs. And we believe this collection of the Protector's own writings will do somewhat to dislodge such errors, and to break up and remove the prejudices with which the young and the old are equally content. A recent writer in one of our journals makes the remark, that the prejudices of New England are in favor of, and not against Cromwell. We doubt the accuracy of this remark. There seems to us rather (and strange that it should be so!) a general disposition among us to rest satisfied with the estimate of Cromwell's character, which has so long passed current in the world. Our people have fallen into the common track of opinion. Their notions respecting the occurrences and personages of the seventeenth century are exclusively drawn from, or at least essentially modified by Clarendon and Hume, the eloquent apologists of tyranny, the bitter enemies of Puritanism and of Republicanism, and therefore wholly unfit to be the expositors to the American mind of such events and scenes as Cromwell figured in. Our American mind has been poisoned by the Tory historians of England. Oliver Cromwell was, of course, a hollow-hearted hypocrite. This is the formula, and this is thought sufficient to sum up and settle his character *per secula seculorum*. He was a sort of Satan the Second; and the question is likely to be scornfully asked, — "What will Carlyle do next for a hero? Mirabeau in the French Revolution was his idol, and English Oliver now?" To show how entirely saturated the American mind is with English prejudices on this subject, in which we have so close an interest, take up the American Encyclopedia, a work, of course, which may be expected to consult somewhat the popular taste in its mode of treating the several subjects it contains; turn to the article on Oliver Cromwell; read it through, and you

find it filled, from beginning to end, with the old, stale, stereotyped, aristocratic, anti-American ideas. Hypocrisy — that is the only attribute ascribed to the Protector, with the exception of sufficient intellectual ability and native talent to make the favorite vice more prominent and hideous. That such errors and prejudices should exist in England, is not to be wondered at. It is for the interest of the existing state of things there, to throw into shade the period of the Puritan ascendancy, and to blacken the memory of the man who represents in history that struggle against oppression in Church and State. Dull book this of Carlyle's, say the English critics. They do not wish it to be regarded as other than dull. They do not want the ghost of the Protector to rise before their vision in the guise of a mailed saint, ready to vindicate the rights of humanity. We can understand an English reviewer, when he says that Cromwell's life was "a sham, a giant lie, an incessant simulation;" that "the King was murdered, martyred; the Church hath it so, and the Church influence will outlast myriads of Cromwells, Canters, and Carlyles;" that "he" (Cromwell) "rests bathed in blood, the blood of his King, his Country, and his Church." We can understand all this, when it oozes from the pen of an English Tory or Churchman. But how the same extravagances should have come to pass current for sound, genuine opinions in this free America; among the descendants of the very men who were contemporaries with Oliver, with whom he had even gone so far at one time as to cast in his lot; among the children of those men, whose views were precisely the same as the Commonwealth's men had at home, whose ideas and passions were the same, whose impulses and motives were drawn from a common source, and who did here, in the wilderness, the very same work in the noiseless and undisturbed way of growth, which the patriot saints of England were obliged to effect at home by violence, — a violence so sudden and excessive, that the reaction effaced in a few years all that had been accomplished; — this we cannot understand.

We know very well what to make of it, when a stiff English conservative remarks, that "the abuses even of constituted authority are preferable to their remedy by Revolution;" alias, the mortification which has seized a

limb, and which is creeping up, up, towards the vitals, ought to be suffered to go on, rather than resort to the knife to cut off the limb, and thus save the body. But it would be strange indeed, if anything approaching to such a perverse doctrine should find admittance into our public sentiment. We, or rather our fathers for us, braved the dangers and toils and sacrifices of one bloody revolution, which was in fact only a continuation of the Revolution of 1640 in England, the fruit of the same seed that was sown in the Anglo-Saxon mind at the Reformation. The winds blew a part of that seed across the Atlantic, and here it lodged, and remained protected, until the soil was made favorable, and circumstances under Providence became propitious to its springing, and growth, and maturity. But although our Revolution in 1775, on which all our consequence as a nation rests, proves the sentiment which we have quoted to be false and absurd, yet we are no advocates of revolutionary remedies. We hold them to be the ultimate resort. But we hold also, that the only way to avoid the necessity for this resort is, to keep the work of reform continually active, to root out the weeds as fast as they grow. We are living under institutions which allow this necessary work of reform to be done, which demand that it be done. There is among us in fact, certainly there ought to be, according to the theory of our social system, a continual revolution going on, a peaceful reform of abuses as soon as they are discovered to be abuses, a gradual renovation from year to year. A tight, strait-jacket conservatism must inevitably lead to an outbreak, to a violent and bloody outbreak. This was the case in France. The abuses, corruptions, abominations, in government, religion, morals and society, which existed in France previously to the first Revolution in that country, and which had been allowed to accumulate generation after generation, in accordance with the English maxim given above, at last came to a head. The bad humors in the system must come out. It was time there should be an outbreak; and it could not but be sanguinary and anarchical. And the enemies of all change, here and elsewhere, would do well to apply the wisdom, which such historical events contain, to the condition and prospects of their respective countries. The price we have to pay for our

political and religious privileges is unceasing watchfulness and perpetual revolution. The state of feeling which is thus engendered among us is, doubtless, very inconvenient and uncomfortable. There is a constant itching and scratching, and twisting and turning over. We cannot sleep. The reformers will not let us rest. And so we do anything but bless the reformers. Very uncomfortable this is, no doubt. But probably it is necessary. It may be the chief condition upon which Providence allows us to retain what we most value. Once let this irritation on the surface of society cease, and it will be an awful omen of death. The timid conservative may say, 'Well, an outbreak will inevitably come. But it may be staved off yet awhile. It will not come, at least, in my day. The present system of things will last as long as I shall last.' This may be the truth. It is quite likely to be true. But it is not very courageous, to put off the conflict, which, it is allowed, must come, until we are quietly wrapt in dust, away from the ills that posterity must then inherit. To all who study Providence, as unfolded and recorded in history, it cannot but be apparent, that we must either, in our day and generation, do our duty faithfully, and reform abuses gradually, as we discover them, or we must let them grow and multiply, a hundred heads for one, and mercifully leave it to our successors on the stage of life to do battle, (and a bloody battle it must then ultimately be!) with the monster which a slight effort might have strangled in its birth.

In Mr. Carlyle's work, we have evidence, not only of the peculiar traits of his genius, with which the reading public has long been familiar, but of exactness, sagacity of judgment, and patience in ascertaining matters of fact, — qualities these, comparatively humble, but quite necessary in their place. There are some reasons which would lead us to expect that the chief interest in such a publication would be on this side of the great water. We venture to say, that any truth-coveting reader among us, who may have derived what notions he has respecting the Puritans and Oliver Cromwell from the advocates of Monarchy and Prelatism, — who think that a scratch on the flesh of a King is an occurrence to make the world shudder, while they attach little importance, if any, to the ghastly wounds inflicted by tyranny upon the limbs of humanity, and who

judge that the Gospel loses its efficacy unless it make its toilet before the High-Church looking-glass, — will find in this book some things to set him on thinking; likely enough, indeed, to upset his old theories and judgments. At least such a reader may convince himself, that there is another way to look at the great subject than through infidel Hume's or cavalier Clarendon's eyes.

We of New England are of Puritan origin. We are one result of the Puritan movement in the seventeenth century. We come of the men who were co-temporaries, co-workers, co-sufferers with those who did the work of the Commonwealth in England. We know well what Puritanism has effected here. Its monuments are everywhere about us. All of intrinsically good that we possess, all that wise men and righteous men value, and would hold on by, and keep, if possible, from dying, is traceable directly to the Puritan colonists of this western continent. And few, if any, among us will find it difficult to assent cordially, when Mr. Carlyle says, that this Puritanism was a *Heroism*; — "perhaps no nobler Heroism ever transacted itself on this earth." We shall not hesitate to call that a heroism, which inspired the Christian Pilgrims, who disembarked on our glazed coast in the winter of 1620, and began their "wilderness work" "in these ends of the earth."

And we would say, in closing our remarks, that it is especially deserving of attention, it is, in fact, the great lesson which our subject teaches, that all the freedom which is enjoyed in England or in this country has had its origin with the Puritans. Let Hume be our authority for the first part of this assertion; of the remainder we will ourselves assume the responsibility. Indeed we are convinced it will be found to be universally true, that all the progress which society has made in civil and political matters, may be traced directly to religion. The abstract principles upon which human rights are founded have been recognized, and put into an intelligible form, and made familiar to the minds of men, and matured for use, through the agency of the Christian Church.

Our ancestors were the authors of Congregationalism, the foundation-principle of which is, that each congregation of worshipping Christians is a church-body, entire and complete by itself, fully competent to manage its own

affairs, accountable to no other ecclesiastical body, and bound only to obey the great Head of the universal Church. And this was a singularly bold step for men to take, who had been bred amidst the high-toned claims of the English Church, — to say, that Bishops and Archbishops and other Church dignitaries were nothing, and that the brethren who joined voluntarily in the same covenant, and who associated themselves together to do the Lord's work in any place, were everything. They adopted a principle, the true nature, character and results of which could not for many generations be understood; a principle, which would not fail ultimately to be a source of civil as well as of religious freedom. This principle, it is not too much to say, has been the origin of all the freedom we enjoy. To the independent religious societies which our Puritan forefathers established must the historian look, if he would discover the nurseries of North American freedom. There the cradle was rocked. There the early bias was given. There the habits of the people were formed, their habits of thinking, feeling and acting. The practice of a century and a half had accustomed men to bow to no earthly authority in the Church, except what they consented to themselves, — the authority which resided in small bodies, of which each individual member might feel himself to be an important part. And when the Revolution of 1775 broke out, the people in this portion of the Colonies had only to apply to civil affairs the same principle, which had long been familiar to them in the Church. W. P. L.

Art. XI. — THE UNITARIAN DENOMINATION.*

Dr. Putnam's discourse at the Installation of Mr. Fosdick has given rise to more conversation than any sermon preached in this city for many years, with the exception of Mr. Parker's at the South Boston ordination; not so much, however, we apprehend, from the novelty or strength of his

* *A Discourse delivered at the Installation of Rev. David Fosdick, as Pastor of the Hollis Street Church, Boston, March* 3, 1846. By George Putnam. Together with the Charge, Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the People. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 8vo. pp. 72.

positions, (or his main position, we should rather say,) as from the surprise which was felt at the exhibition of such views from the author of the discourse on such an occasion. Mr. Putnam has fully justified himself, we think, for bringing the subject before the public in this particular manner, since his object was, if possible, to draw general attention to remarks which he thought it important should be made. The event has shown that in this respect he chose his time and place with his usual sagacity. He has, also, amply vindicated himself from any imputation of unfairness in not printing the sermon precisely as it was delivered, by the statement which he makes in the preface of the changes he has introduced. The discourse therefore stands now upon its own merits, to be judged without any bias from the associations which it acquired in the delivery.

Of its merits, when thus independently examined, we cannot speak as we should be glad, and as we are accustomed, to speak of whatever comes from the writer. We not only dissent from him in his general purpose and in many of his illustrations, but we are compelled to say that the discourse seems to us to fall much below his usual pulpit performances. The impression which we received when we heard it, has been confirmed by repeated perusals. It lacks the glow which we have before found in his productions, and as an argumentative discussion, is open to severe criticism. The preface shows us that Mr. Putnam is interested in the views which he has presented, from a deep conviction of their truth, but if we had only the sermon before us, and knew nothing of its author, we should be tempted to think he had published his crude opinions without even reviewing his manuscript to mark the incongruities of his own reasoning. Our limits prevent us from entering on a thorough examination of the discourse, or the subject which it has brought into such prominence before our community, but we cannot think that many pages are needed to expose the unsoundness of the train of thought which here invites our judgment.

The position on which Mr. Putnam plants himself, and which he labors through the whole discourse to defend, is, that Unitarians should discard and disown any denominational existence. He thinks that both the principles they profess and the policy they ought to pursue should dissuade

them from multiplying denominational bonds, and should induce them to relinquish whatever ecclesiastical ties or usages they now have, which may give them, or seem to give them, the form and bearing of a denomination. He maintains that we not only ought not to be, but that we are not and cannot be, a denomination. In his desire to establish this point, he breaks out in an indignant remonstrance against the notion, that we have any compactness, coherence, union, or substantive existence whatever, as a body. "Us! there is no us in any corporate sense, and it was never meant there should be; I pray God there never may be." If Mr. Putnam had paused over this sentence before proceeding to the next, he is too good a scholar not to have perceived, that by his use of the word "corporate" he had changed entirely the aspect of his argument. No one imagines that we have a *corporate* existence. No one wishes we should have, or believes we can have. But we may be a denomination, and a very efficient denomination, without this. Mr. Putnam, doubtless, meant to assert, as we have just intimated, that the Unitarian body is a mere name, a phantom, an illusion. "There is no us." And yet all through his sermon he talks about "we" and "us," just as if the words denoted a visible reality. Strike out these words from the discourse, and it will fall to pieces. "We are not a denomination, in the common and full meaning of that term," says he, (p. 4); and yet, "in point of influence in the organization of society, and in shaping the general course of thought, we are one of the strongest," (p. 34). Well, that is enough for our content. A denomination strong enough to have such influence is something real. Seriously, this playing false and loose with *we* and *us* should have been avoided by one so cautious and upright as our friend.

But whether we are a denomination or not, Mr. Putnam contends that we ought not to be; and in conducting his argument selects three points of attack upon the mischievous error which he would overthrow. He condemns our ecclesiastical usages — such as we have; everybody knows they are few and simple enough. He rebukes our narrowness in refusing the Christian name to any one who claims it. And he chastises us for not entertaining a more just conception of the nature of Christian fellowship. We will follow him a little way in each of these three assaults.

Mr. Putnam pronounces a sentence of condemnation on almost all our ways of expressing religious sympathy. Ecclesiastical councils and ministerial associations receive his especial censure; while the American Unitarian Association, which presents more of a sectarian aspect than anything else which we have among us, obtains, singularly enough, a reluctant permission to go on and accomplish its work. Now we really think Mr. Putnam is spending his strength upon windmills and moonshine, when he exerts himself so vigorously to rescue us from the evils which arise out of our inartificial and voluntary organizations. We doubt that there are such serious evils as he seems to descry, lurking in our path or lowering in our horizon. Some inconveniences and difficulties we experience now; and we should be tried by a similar experience, if we had no councils and no associations and no meetings and no name, for inconvenience and difficulty belong to man's condition, and so long as the flesh detains and the world encompasses us, we must expect to meet them. But all the embarrassment which we have yet experienced, or are likely to encounter, can be easily borne, and need not drive us to relinquish the good old ways in which generations have walked, to their own comfort and for an example to their children. We like these councils and associations, which Congregationalism has accepted without any sacrifice of its fundamental principle. They are pleasant in remembrance, and in spite of the death-blow which has been aimed at them, we have many a pleasant vision in prospect. We should regret to see them laid aside, and least of all should we like that purely clerical management of ecclesiastical occasions, which would grow up under Mr. Putnam's plan of avoiding a representation of churches. It is this very feature, the union of churches, and not of ministers alone — the incorporation of lay influence with clerical — which is one of the safeguards of our religious liberty.

We feel some regret, that so much attention has been bestowed on these subsidiary portions of the discourse before us. We fear that it has thus been withdrawn from the main purpose of the writer, which, as we understand him, is to establish an individuality of action that would be fatal to union or cooperation. He does not, of course, so regard it, but he appears to us the advocate of the extremest

individualism. To use the cant word of the day, he is an ultraist of the first water. We cannot go along with him, and we are glad that neither his arguments, nor our own judgment founded on some observation and reflection, compel us to go along with him.

Passing on to his next battery, he discusses the question, what constitutes a right to the Christian name. We confess we have read some pages in this part of the discourse with astonishment. It is not only the reasoning to which we find ourselves unable to give an assent, but some of the statements assumed as the basis of this reasoning sound strange to our ears. Mr. Putnam declares it to be "our theory, that any one desiring to be of us may come into all ecclesiastical relations with us, unless we are obliged to deny him to be a Christian believer;" that, according to our theory, we should be bound to receive any such person, and "give him free course and furtherance in spreading his doctrines in our name!"—that is, give him free permission to enact the hypocrite. We can only say, that we never heard of such a theory before, and all the practice of our denomination has been directly in the face of such a construction. Have we ever maintained, has a single Unitarian journal, writer, or preacher ever affirmed, that any one may come into *all ecclesiastical relations* with us, provided only he be a Christian believer? Have we ever expected, or desired, that Roman Catholics, or Calvinists, or Methodists, (Father Taylor even,) should "come into *all* ecclesiastical relations with us?" Yet we have never felt ourselves obliged to doubt their Christian belief. The statement is palpably erroneous, unless its correctness be saved by the clause — "desiring to be of us;" and then it is reduced to a harmless common-place, — that whoever wishes to be a Unitarian has our leave to become one. Mr. Putnam asks, with all sobriety, "if any persons, ministers, or churches, holding those systems, wish to join our denomination, and so become identified with us, what should we do?" We would ask him in return, by what process of thought he is able to conceive of persons *holding those systems* becoming identified with us? The very fact that they are Romanists, or Calvinists, is an insuperable barrier. Bitter and sweet cannot become identical, while they retain their distinctive properties.

Again, Mr. Putnam, in speaking of the Rationalists, affirms, that "if we receive them and own them, and enter into all ecclesiastical relations with them, (unless we make such a protest as is equivalent to a decided exclusion of them,) we sanction their fatal substractions, and give countenance and currency to" their "opinions." Without noticing the fallacy which recurs here, in the introduction of the word "all," we need only express our amazement at Mr. Putnam's giving the authority of his name to a principle against which we, as a body, have always remonstrated, from the days of the General Repository to the hour when this sentiment was promulgated from the Hollis Street pulpit. It is the point for which some of our hardest battles have been fought, that we are *not* responsible for the tenets of those with whom we may think proper to hold ecclesiastical relations, — that we do not sanction their subtractions, nor give countenance to their opinions. And now, one of our own number, a leader in our host, advances just the opposite doctrine! "Tempora mutantur, et nos" — no, *we* have not changed our ground. Mr. Putnam does not here speak for us. In another part of his discourse he says, that "there is a vague notion" that a minister declines official "fellowship with those whom he does not invite into his pulpit;" but in this instance, he perceives that the fact constitutes altogether too narrow a foundation for so broad an inference. Many circumstances besides difference of opinion may prevent ministerial exchanges. To say nothing of distance, clergymen holding substantially the same belief have been settled near one another for years, and never exchanged pulpits, yet, surely, without meaning to disown one another. On the other hand, ministers may exchange professional offices without making themselves responsible for each other's opinions.

The whole of Mr. Putnam's reasoning in the central portion of his discourse is vitiated by confounding the recognition of a person's right to the Christian name with his admission to our denominational sympathies. Just separate the two, and all which he has written between pages 15 and 27 loses its pertinency as an argument against our maintaining a sectarian character. "The theory of our denomination requires only the Christian name as a condition of membership." Where did Mr. Putnam find such a theory? It may be, that the Christian name, according

to us, is a sufficient ground for granting to another all the relations to which a Christian is entitled. But this is a very different thing from regarding him as a member of the denomination to which we belong. It does not follow from our allowing another to wear the Christian name, or freely admitting his right to it and all its privileges, that we embrace him within our theological sympathies. That so manifest an error should have been committed by an acute mind, surprises us greatly. All this discussion about the Christian name has nothing to do with the design of the sermon. Suppose we allow that there are Christians in every Church, and out of every Church, from Ignatius Loyola to Dr. Frederick Strauss; does that require us to include them all among members of our denomination? Is the alternative, a full participation in our religious sympathies or the dissolution of all our existing organizations? No man in his senses will take this ground.

There is much in the discussion respecting the Christian name to which we have adverted, that is justly and forcibly said, if viewed independently of the immediate purpose. Yet there are some remarks which, if we had room, we should be glad to notice. In regard to what is said respecting ecclesiastical, doctrinal, and critical tests, we probably should not differ from our brother; but when he speaks of a moral test, he goes beyond our ability of concurrence. The argument rests on the assumption that we cannot ascertain *character*, and therefore "have no right to exercise a moral adjudication." Surely, however, there are signs of the inward life on which we may rely. "Personal character wholly out of the reach of our public cognizance?" What! may we pronounce no one to be a bad man? When we read the histories of the French revolution, are we forbidden to form an opinion respecting the characters of the men whose atrocities make us almost doubt if they were not demons in human shape? Can we help doing it? Must we have allowed that the man who was on trial the other day in this city for murder, and the woman whose course of profligacy was closed by so frightful a death, were Christians, if they had chosen to take the name? How then shall we interpret our Lord's words, "By their fruits ye shall know them?" What does Mr. Putnam himself mean, when he requires of the Rationalists, that

"as a class they *manifest* the usual degree of sincerity?" Why undertake to judge of their word by their conduct? The truth is, we do and must impute character to men, and act accordingly; and though we may in some cases, or in many, form a false judgment, yet there is no purpose for which it is more proper that we should institute a judgment, than that we may "determine public, visible, ecclesiastical relations."

The definition of the Christian name for which Mr. Putnam contends, makes it equivalent to a geographical designation. As a nation choose to be called Christian, rather than Pagan or Mahommedan, so an individual prefers being called a Christian to bearing some other name, or no name at all. Now if there were a general agreement so to understand the name—as really meaning nothing, we should only suffer in seeing one of the most significant and precious words in human speech stripped of its value. But, we thank God, this never can be brought about; and so long as the name must mean something, we rejoice that it is likely to have at least as positive a meaning as our denomination have usually given to it.

Mr. Putnam's remarks upon Christian fellowship would be valuable, if it were not for his dread of those "ecclesiastical bonds," which, though they are represented by him as no more than spiders' webs, yet do sadly annoy him. With the Apostle he is ready to exclaim, "Would that all who hear me were such as I am, except these bonds." Fellowship, however, is a good thing, and the word is a good word. And we cannot see that Mr. Putnam has shown that any of our modes of expressing Christian fellowship are hurtful and dangerous. As to the particular act which he specifies, the giving of the Right Hand at an ordination, we apprehend that most persons will say that it is a much more beautiful and expressive service when offered in the name of a number of ministers and delegates of churches, rejoicing in the union which they are called to solemnize, than if it were merely the symbol of individual feeling. Mr. Putnam declares that in future, if he should "have occasion to perform that part in an ordaining service, he will do it, not ecclesiastically, not in the name of the council or of any definite number of churches, but in his own behalf, and in behalf of all persons or churches, pres-

ent or absent, of the council or not of it, who may sympathize with him in the act." Happily, fallible man may review his own decisions, and we trust that our friend will find in the *sympathy* of the ordaining council the very justification of his appearance as their organ, which will relieve him of any embarrassment in the matter. That "all relations of an official and ecclesiastical kind, subsisting among clergymen, should cease," is a result, which the writer of this sentence would have seen to be, from the nature of the case, impossible, if his mind had not been beset by the "gorgons and chimeras dire" of denominational organization.

Mr. Putnam, in approaching the close of his discourse, replies to the anticipated objection, that we might lose a portion of our efficiency in resisting error or diffusing truth, if we should "dissolve every denominational bond, and disclaim all ecclesiastical relations except those existing within each separate church." We cannot perceive that he has weakened the force of this objection in the least. He has only shown, that individual effort may accomplish much, and that ecclesiastical censures or hierarchical engines are not sufficient to prevent the spread of either truth or error; and that truth has an immortal life, while error must decay and perish. But he has not shown, that individual effort need be hindered by cooperative exertion, nor that much more may not be effected by a union of hearts and hands in carrying on religious enterprises than by the separate labors of the most thoughtful or the most active. The tenacity with which he holds on by his theory of individualism, in the face of facts which seem to overthrow it, is pleasantly evinced in a note, in which he frankly acknowledges that the history of some of the prominent English sects is adverse to his position, but adds, that "we do not know all the circumstances, under which those denominations began or carried on their various measures," and a knowledge of which, he justly remarks, is important to a judgment in the case. We have been inclined to believe that the history of both the Methodist and the Unitarian denominations in England is sufficiently well known, to justify us in drawing pregnant conclusions from the success of the one and the slow increase of the other.

When, therefore, Mr. Putnam concludes his discourse with the counsel, that we should cast aside all "ecclesiastical relations or regulations, except such as pertain to our separate churches within themselves," as mere "external encumbrances," we feel that he has addressed to us an exhortation for which he had by no means provided a sufficient support in his previous remarks.

We suggested at the commencement of our remarks, that Mr. Putnam's position had not the attraction of novelty. It is one which has been held by many of our body from the first appearance of Unitarianism in this country. It belonged to the early days of the religious movement which in the course of time took this name, and the favor which it then enjoyed was the natural fruit of the reaction against opinions and usages which had acquired a hard and oppressive character. We have outgrown the influences of that time, and find the need of admitting large qualifications of this principle. Our tendency towards association is just as natural as was our fathers' towards an extreme in the other direction. Both these tendencies have always existed in our body, and according to the intellectual or moral constitution of those who belong to this body, they have inclined the one way or the other. We can understand how Mr. Putnam has been led to urge an abandonment of those simple means of preserving order and promoting unity which have prevailed among us. We have been plagued with some "ecclesiastical" difficulties, and he is anxious to avoid similar embarrassment in future. But the same or greater difficulties would arise, if we should adopt all that he proposes in place of our present methods. Every state must have its perplexities, and cases may occur under every system, or under no system, which would cause anxiety and trouble.

In our review of the ground over which Mr. Putnam has led us, we have been conscious of a continual struggle between our personal regard for the author of the discourse, and the conviction that so serious an assault upon what we value as just and useful should not pass without an attempt to counteract its effect. We shelter ourselves behind Mr. Putnam's own defence, in his preface; we have "felt it to be incumbent upon us, for the truth's sake, to do what we can," to restrain the influence of opinions

which we think unsound and of disastrous tendency. We cannot dismiss the subject without a few remarks of a more general character.

In the first place, we can discover no occasion for the blows which have been laid so thickly upon our ecclesiastical state. The practices which are pronounced so hurtful seem to us harmless and beneficial. We need not repeat what we have already said of the troubles which must now and then arise out of every condition of things. Let the principle advocated in this discourse prevail, — destroy what ecclesiastical unity we have, dissolve our associations, extinguish our denominational sympathies, and let every man work "in his own place and sphere, unencumbered" by these vexatious ties, — will there be an end of trouble? Will nothing again occur to perplex or distress us? Is individualism a principle of such mighty efficacy? We doubt it much.

Mr. Putnam says we shall at least secure consistency, shall relieve ourselves from a false position, shall be true to our principles. What there is in our principles inconsistent with such a measure of sectarian action as we have exhibited, it requires a keener sight than ours to discover. We have detected no disposition in our body to introduce a despotism over conscience, to impose tests in contravention of personal rights, or to build up a "church establishment." We have freedom enough, latitude of opinion enough, private judgment enough. Pray let us have a little union, for love's sake, and a little cooperation, for truth's sake. We shall endanger no principle to which we have ever clung, by making our ecclesiastical relations somewhat more intimate than they are. There is no need of our becoming "less decidedly a denomination" than we are, in order to our securing "a high and true position." We hold such a position now. Let us not be tempted to forsake it by any deceptive appearance encircling some other mountain-top.

According to the writer of this discourse we have nothing to bind us together as a denomination. In attempting to maintain a union of this kind we are not only going against our principles, but trying to make bricks without straw, playing the part of Egyptian task-masters with ourselves. "We have not the essential requisites of

a denominational existence." Incidentally, however, Mr. Putnam reveals to us the cement, and basis of our union. "Our strength," he says, "lies in the sympathy which our more free and rational, though somewhat indefinite, theology finds among intelligent and influential men." We want nothing more than this. It is this "free and rational theology" on which our denomination rests, and "sympathy" in such a theology which binds us together. This is strong enough for all our purposes. It has made us so much of a denomination as we are, and it may give us yet more of coherence and stability.

We are glad to believe, that it is too late in the day for the doctrine of this discourse to find general favor. It may please some minds and disturb others, but it will not unsettle our usages nor turn back the current of opinion which is setting so strongly in an opposite direction. For twenty years and more the principle of union has been unfolding its value to our eyes, and proving its efficacy in our hands. We are not prepared to give it up on account of some incidental or temporary inconvenience. Its advantages are a thousand-fold greater than the evils which are charged upon it. We shall not unlearn the lesson of a quarter of a century, and begin to spell our duty from a new alphabet. We cannot do it, if we would. Nature is stronger than argument and eloquence. It *is* argument and eloquence. And nature will compel us to seek that interchange of sympathies, which is the security of our denominational existence. They who think alike in this age of the world find one another out; and that men should acknowledge common convictions, in this period of enterprise and philanthropy, and not propose to each other a common action, is just one of those dreams of the closet, which, thank Heaven! can never be realized in actual life. A denomination we are, and a denomination we shall be, so long as there are any of us left. It is not very long since we were told that Unitarianism was at its mortal hour. It survived that prophecy; and was never more active or more efficient, never gave more signs of life and never supplied occasion for more cordial sympathies or more intelligent affinities, than now. Cooperation is one of the demands of the age, and we do well to fall in with it. The theory of individualism is utterly impracticable. If it could once have been

carried out, it is now opposed by all the tendencies of modern society. Acute observers and profound thinkers have alike acknowledged the power of association. It is a mighty instrument in the hands of evil; it may be used most efficiently in the service of truth and humanity.

We cannot give up our denominational existence, we cannot forsake our religious associations, we cannot resign our ecclesiastical usages to the past. We would multiply rather than diminish ties which impose no irksome restraint, would draw more close, rather than loosen, the bonds of our union. We remember those whose sympathy gave us strength in former days, and to whose efforts as we joined our own, we felt how much is gained by combination of wills and labors. We cannot forget their example. And least of all, can we be silent when we are called to adopt a principle, which would not only inscribe *folly* as the title of what we esteem the best part of our past history, but would compel us to relinquish our present agencies for the diffusion of Christian truth and moral influence. "What charitable agency, combined or individual, need be stopped," if we accept his doctrine, asks Mr. Putnam. With such a question before us from his pen, we almost doubt if we have not read his whole discourse backwards. What agency be stopped? Go and put this pamphlet into the hands of the officers of our associations for missionary purposes, and tell them to act upon its principles; and they will resign their places instantly. Our anniversary meetings must cease, our tract depositories be shut up, our social gatherings be branded with obloquy; and Christian zeal, instead of breathing the healthful air of sympathy, must live upon its own energy till that is exhausted, and then it may die, and no one mourn its departure.

We believe that a better history than this will cover the future. And so does our brother, whose discourse has called forth these remarks. But the principle which he has commended to the consideration of his Christian brethren would lead by a logical and inevitable process, if it should be adopted in practice, to these consequences. And therefore it is, — because we value our religious faith and wish to see it spread far and wide, — that we have not hesitated to express our dissent from the deliberately formed opinions of one whom we respect and love. E. S. G.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A Discourse delivered in the West Church in Boston, August 3, 1845. By CHARLES LOWELL, one of the Ministers of the West Church. Cambridge: Metcalf & Co. 1845. 8vo. pp. 25.

A Discourse, delivered in Dublin, N. H., September 7, 1845. *It being the Sabbath after the twenty-fifth Anniversary of his Ordination.* By LEVI W. LEONARD, Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society. Keene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 28.

The Church of the Disciples in Boston. A Sermon on the Principles and Methods of the Church of the Disciples. By the Pastor, JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. Delivered Sunday morning and evening, Dec. 7, 1845. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 36.

A Discourse, delivered in the Church of the First Congregational Society in Burlington, Sunday, December 21, 1845, *the Anniversary of the Sabbath which preceded the Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth.* By OLIVER W. B. PEABODY. Burlington. 1846. 8vo. pp. 22.

The Kingdom of Heaven. A Sermon, preached at the Installation of Rev. John T. Sargent, as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Somerville, Mass., Wednesday, February 18, 1846. By WILLIAM H. FURNESS, Pastor of the First Unitarian Church in Philadelphia. With the Charge, Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the People. Somerville. 1846. 8vo. pp. 48.

A Sermon preached at the Installation of Rev. A. M. Bridge, as Colleague Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Bernardston, Mass., Feb. 18, 1846. By CHANDLER ROBBINS. Together with the Right Hand of Fellowship, and Address to the People. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. pp. 42.

Individual and Public Reform. A Discourse delivered on Fast Day, April 2, 1846, *at the West Church in Boston.* By C. A. BARTOL, *Junior Pastor.* Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1846. 8vo. pp. 16.

The Sin and Danger of Self-Love, described in a Sermon preached at Plymouth, in New England, 1621. By ROBERT CUSHMAN. London: Printed. Plymouth: [Massachusetts] Re-printed by Nathaniel Coverly, 1785. Boston: Published by Rebecca Wiswell, 1846. 12mo. pp. 35.

The Connection between Geography and History: A Lecture delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, at

Hartford, Conn., August, 1845. By GEORGE S. HILLARD. Boston: Ticknor & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 43.

Lecture on the Necessity of Physiology, delivered before the American Institute of Instruction, at Hartford, August 22, 1845. By EDWARD JARVIS, M. D., of Dorchester, Mass. Boston: W. D. Ticknor & Co. 1845. 12mo. pp. 55.

An Address at the Opening of the Town Hall, in Brookline, on Tuesday, 14 *October*, 1845. By JOHN PIERCE, D. D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Brookline. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 52.

An Address on Temperance, delivered in the Town-Hall, Brighton, Sunday Evening, Dec. 21, 1845. By FREDERIC A. WHITNEY, Minister of the First Church. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 22.

An Address on Pauperism, delivered before the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, in the Central Church, Winter Street, on Sunday Evening, February 22, 1846. By JOHN T. SARGENT, Pastor of the First Congregational Society in Somerville. Boston: B. H. Greene. 1846. 8vo. pp. 40.

Remarks on a Letter from the Hollis Street Society to their Unitarian Brethren, with the Documents relating to the recent call of a Minister by that Society. Boston. 1846. 8vo. pp. 22.

Remarks on Europe, relating to Education, Peace and Labor; and their Reference to the United States. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1846. 8vo. pp. 42.

Sketches of a few Distinguished Men of Newbury and Newburyport. By S. SWETT. No. 1, Capt. Moses Brown, of the United States Navy. Boston. 1846. 12mo. pp. 23.

The Panidèa; or, an Omnipresent Reason considered as the Creative and Sustaining Logos. By THEOPTES. Boston: T. H. Webb & Co. 1846. 8vo. pp. 176.

A Condensed Anti-Slavery Bible Argument. By a CITIZEN OF VIRGINIA. New York. 1845. 8vo. pp. 91.

Dr. Lowell's Discourse was preached at the expiration of forty years from the commencement of his ministry in the West church, the small wooden building, in which he began to preach, standing almost alone in the fields, (though on the site of the present edifice,) in a part of the city then called "New Boston." The author speaks as to "familiar friends," in the tone of sincerity and affectionate confidence and with the directness which have uniformly marked his pulpit performances. He states the principles which have governed him in the conduct of his long ministry, leaving historical details, or a more full exposition of his views and of his position in respect to religious parties, to a very interesting appendix. — Mr. Leonard's Dis-

course, delivered at the expiration of a quarter of a century from the time of his ordination, contains a brief review of his ministry, with such statistics as usually enter into productions of this kind. His lot has been cast in a retired parish, in a town with a "diminishing population" in consequence of emigration, yet the discourse bears witness, that he has labored diligently, and, we should say, successfully; his ministry has been peaceful, and he may yet look forward to many years of usefulness. An appendix contains an account of the first settlers of Dublin, its population at different periods, with other historical facts of interest.—Mr. Clarke's Sermon is a valuable document, and will be read with interest not only by the members of the "Church of the Disciples" themselves, but by multitudes of others who may wish to know something of their past history, their principle of association, mode of worship, leading ideas, "methods and external arrangements." On all these subjects the reader will find in the pamphlet the desired information presented in a simple and clear style. — Mr. Peabody's subject is the obligation we owe to the Pilgrim fathers of New England, a theme which is in little danger of being worn out, and on which he has constructed a Discourse distinguished for just sentiment and discriminating remark, blending in due proportion narrative and reflection in a style marked by great purity, clearness, and simplicity. — Mr. Furness's Installation Sermon is distinguished by the peculiar spirituality of views and glowing style, which we are accustomed to look for in all that comes from his pen. Jesus, he says, "lived in a very different world from ours, but still a present world," and "in our best moments, we all catch glimpses of the world of Christ." We should endeavor to rise to it in our daily life, thus entering the kingdom of heaven; the "way" into which forms the subject of the discourse, and naturally leads the writer to speak of the miracles of Christ and their significance according to his views of them, with which the public is already familiar. The other performances printed along with the sermon have a reference more or less direct to the times, and are marked by the usual characteristics of their authors. — The nature and foundation of that union, which Christ would have exist among his followers, the causes which have hitherto impeded its growth, the way in which it is to be sought, and present encouraging symptoms, especially in the reforms which, amid great differences of opinion, have united so many hearts in beautiful and harmonious action, are among the topics which the reader will find treated in Mr. Robbins's Sermon, with his usual felicity of style and illustration, and the Right Hand and Address well harmonize with it. — The object of Mr. Bartol's Discourse is to show that "individual reform alone is public reform;" individual action, he thinks, in

the main preferable to the action of societies; at least the latter is insufficient without the former. He instances particularly the slavery, peace, and temperance reforms, on which, and the measures used in promoting them, he expresses his thoughts with freedom and independence. — Mr. Cushman's is a lay Sermon, preached at Plymouth during the first year of the settlement, and now printed for the fourth time. The "Epistle Dedicatory" bearing date "Plymouth, December 12, 1621," is the best part of the original publication, though the Sermon, from the time and place of its delivery, is worth reading as matter of curiosity. The edition of 1685 contains an appendix, giving some account of the author, and written by Judge Davis, who suffered an error to creep into it, as he tells the public in his edition of Morton's Memorial, p. 375. The error, that of attributing to the original Colonists a community of property, is not of much importance, yet it is to be regretted, since the work was to be reprinted, that an opportunity had not been afforded the venerable writer of correcting it.

The influence of physical causes on national character and civilization, and on the intellectual and moral development of the race, has been always recognized, but we have never met with it so convincingly and eloquently set forth and illustrated as in Mr. Hillard's Address on the "Connexion of Geography with History," which deserves to be carefully studied, especially by teachers, and may be read with pleasure and profit by all. Its pure and elevated moral tone adds to its value and charms. — Dr. Jarvis strenuously urges the study of physiology in our common schools, and though, as he informs the public, portions of his Lecture appeared in an article contributed by him to the "July" [read September] number of the Examiner, 1843, this circumstance will not, we suppose, as regards most of its readers, deprive it of the interest of novelty. — Dr. Pierce, as he informs us in his present Address, has already delivered three Historical Discourses relating to the small town of Brookline, yet he has now been able to glean materials enough to fill a pamphlet of fifty-two pages. Many of his facts and statistics, as might be supposed, are minute. This is one excellence of the Address viewed as a local historical document. The author expresses his intention, should his life be spared a year longer, to deliver another discourse, at the completion of half a century from the time of his ordination, in which he will "gather up the fragments, that nothing be lost." There is not probably another town in the commonwealth, or in the United States, the history of which will have been so minutely and faithfully written. — Mr. Whitney's Address contains a strong appeal in favor of total abstinence, urges the inefficacy of laws without "moral and religious principle," and insists on the importance of a "living

public opinion" and strict practice as the only ground on which the friends of reform can place any secure hope. — There is one great cause of pauperism, Mr. Sargent thinks, which includes all the rest, and that is, the "disproportionate influence allowed to wealth among us," manifested in various forms of extravagance and selfishness; and the remedy, therefore, he says, must be sought in a reform at home, in a more Christian feeling, more intimate sympathy, and more simple and frugal habits, — topics which, along with some others, are treated with great seriousness, and with much force both of thought and expression. — The Hollis Street Pamphlet is a continuation of the controversy to which allusion was made in our Notices contained in the last number. It is issued by the minority, and offers some very free strictures and comments on the "Letter" referred to in its title. — The "Remarks on Europe," as we are informed by an advertisement to the pamphlet, is by Rev. Charles Brooks, and is a reprint from the Knickerbocker of 1843. The pamphlet is well worth reading. Being written abroad (at Rome) by one who had possessed ample means of observation as well as reading, and who is accustomed to use well his opportunities, its statements in regard to European society must be entitled to confidence, and the application of his remarks to America adds to their value and interest. — Mr. Swett's project for publishing "Sketches of a few distinguished men of Newbury and Newburyport" will afford him an opportunity of rescuing from oblivion many facts and biographical traits, interesting alike to the general reader and the antiquary. His account of Capt. Moses Brown, who is the subject of the first Sketch, forms a pleasing and useful little narrative of the life of a man whose memory is worth preserving. — We have not found time to read the "Panidèa" with sufficient attention to comprehend it. Among the titles of its chapters are, "The All resolved into its subjective unity, in the Logos, or Absolute Reason," — "The subjective unity of the Logos, or Absolute Reason, resolved into its objective all, sensuous and supersensuous," — "Spheres sensuous and supersensuous — their correspondence and difference," —"The Me, or Homo Individualis,"—"The Theanthropoid, or Homo Universalis;" — rather formidable titles, but truth we are told, "lies in a well." — The calm and liberal spirit in which the "Bible Argument" is conducted by a "Citizen of Virginia," added to the general soundness of his reasoning and expositions, should secure for it a careful and impartial reading.

We take advantage of the space which remains to us on this page, to suggest the propriety of a clergyman's always indicating his parochial relation on the title-page of a sermon preached by him in any other than his own pulpit. The naked name of the individual sometimes fails to satisfy the curiosity of readers, and seems to betoken a consciousness of celebrity.

INTELLIGENCE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Ecclesiastical Record. — We grieve to learn, that Rev. Mr. Sewall of Scituate has been compelled, by a return of the malady which has before interrupted his professional labors, to ask a dismission from his people. — Also, that Rev. Mr. Lambert of East Cambridge has resigned his ministry on account of ill health. — On the other hand it is a pleasant circumstance to record, that Rev. Mr. Weiss, having in a measure recovered his health, has been induced by the invitation of the society at Watertown to resume the ministry among them, which he relinquished a few months since.

An important decision has been made by the Proprietors of the Purchase Street church in this city. Finding that in consequence of the changes which have recently taken place in that part of the city, from the increase of business and the removal of families to a more quiet neighborhood, their meetinghouse was inconveniently distant from a large number of the congregation, they resolved to sell their present edifice, and erect one on another spot. An arrangement has been made with the subscribers to the fund for the erection of a house of worship on Harrison Avenue, by which their subscription has been transferred to the Purchase Street society. A lot of ground, most favorably situated, has been bought, at the corner of Harrison Avenue and Beach Street, on which a chaste and commodious house will be erected this summer. We understand that the purpose of establishing a new society at the southerly part of the city, for which an act of incorporation had been obtained, has not been relinquished, but is meant to be carried into effect at some future time. — The "Church of the Saviour" have completed their Chapel or Vestry, a very beautiful little building, capable of accommodating three hundred worshippers, where they will hold their religious services during the erection of their meetinghouse, the foundation of which is already laid. — The Broadway society at South Boston have been obliged, by the increase of their numbers, to remove to a larger hall, in which they will in future conduct their worship. — The First Congregational Parish in Lexington are remodelling their house of worship, which was built in 1794, and will now be made more agreeable to modern taste in its interior arrangements. — The First Parish in Framingham have voted to build a new meetinghouse, and will commence the work immediately. — The congregation at Troy, N. Y. contemplate an enlargement of their house.

Among the other denominations in our city we also notice changes in the ministerial relation. — Rev. Mr. Chapin, late of Charlestown, has become associate minister (with Rev. Mr. Ballou) of the Second Universalist society. — Rev. Mr. Skinner, late pastor of the Fifth Universalist church, has accepted an invitation to take charge of a congregation in the city of New York. — Rev. Mr. Banvard, late of Salem, has been installed over the Harrison Avenue Baptist church,

formerly under the care of Rev. Mr. Turnbull. — Rev. Mr. Watson, assistant minister of Trinity church, has resigned his place. A serious difference has arisen between Bishop Eastburn and the "Church of the Advent," which is said to affect his relations with other churches in his diocese. The Bishop deprecates the introduction of Romish usages, and rebukes the Puseyite tendencies of some of those over whom he has the oversight. Their defence has shown any thing but a willingness to succumb to Episcopal authority. We like their independence as much as we dislike their forms.

Benevolent Fraternity of Churches. — The anniversary of this important institution was celebrated on the evening of Fast day, April 2, 1846. Religious services were attended in the Federal Street church. After prayer by Rev. Mr. Smith of New North church, a discourse was delivered by Rev. Mr. Peabody of the King's Chapel, from Matthew xiii. 27, 28, — on the permanent causes of pauperism and the proper remedies. At the meeting for the organization of the new Board held as usual on the evening of the second Sunday after Fast — an interval which gives time for the choice of delegates in the several Branches — Henry B. Rogers Esq. was chosen *President;* Rev. Robert C. Waterston, *Secretary;* Mr. Thomas Tarbell, *Treasurer;* Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, and Mr. Benjamin Seaver, the other members of the Executive Committee. The semiannual Reports of the ministers-at-large were presented, and contained evidence not only of their diligence and devotedness, but of the great and sad need there is of their labors in this city. The subject of licentiousness had received particular attention from one of the ministers, whose Report offered many most painful details. We trust that some means will be found to stay the increase of this destructive vice. It is a difficult subject to discuss, and yet more difficult to deal with practically; but no false delicacy should prevent our considering what may be done to save our city and our homes from a moral corruption, a thousand times worse than the most fearful of physical diseases.

The special purpose of the Fraternity of Churches is the support of the Ministry-at-large in this city. The Pitts Street and Suffolk Street chapels are under their charge; the former being served by Rev. Dr. Bigelow, the latter by Rev. Mr. Cruft. Rev. Mr. Burton is also employed in this Ministry, with less of local restriction than his associates; and it is the hope of those who are entrusted with the financial affairs of the Fraternity, that they shall soon be able to call a fourth laborer into this work. It has been blessed in its results, and may be indefinitely extended.

Levee for the Meadville Theological School. — The success of the Theological School established but little more than a year ago at Meadville, Penn., with the wants of the young men who resort there for instruction, led several ladies in Boston to inquire if they could not do something to increase the resources of the institution. The purpose which they entertained soon spread beyond the "Church of the Disciples," to which the persons with whom it originated belonged, and other ladies expressed their desire to cooperate in carrying it into effect. The plan grew almost insensibly, till it was thought best to apply to the city government for the use of Faneuil Hall,

which was granted. It was proposed to hold a meeting on some evening, to which admittance should be obtained by tickets sold at a low price, while the principal attraction should consist of addresses by different gentlemen. This plan was carried out, on the ninth of April. The arrangements were very simple. A few tables were placed in the hall, at which refreshments were sold, and other articles, contributed by friends of the project; vocal music was introduced between the speeches; and addresses were made by Hon. Stephen C. Phillips, who presided, Rev. J. F. Clarke, Rev. Mr. Edmonds of the "Christian" denomination, Rev. E. Peabody, Rev. Mr. Taylor of the Methodist Connexion, Rev. R. C. Waterston, and Rev. E. S. Gannett. The hall was opened at 5 o'clock P. M., the speaking began at 7 o'clock and ended at 10 o'clock, when the exercises were closed by singing the doxology. The number of tickets sold showed that nearly two thousand persons were present in the course of the evening. The articles which remained on the tables unsold, were offered for sale at a private dwelling on a subsequent day. The amount of receipts, after deducting all expenses, we learn, was $1463,50, which will be sent "to the Faculty of the Meadville School to be used for the benefit of the Institution, as they may judge most necessary." Besides this amount in money, various useful articles which have been procured will be sent for the benefit of the students.

Universalist Convention. — We have wished for room in several of our past numbers, to notice the meeting of the U. S. Convention of Universalists, which was held in this city the last autumn. In reading the very full report of its proceedings given in the *Trumpet*, we were very much impressed with the interest which must have belonged to the occasion. An earnest and harmonious spirit pervaded all the exercises. An important step was taken towards a more stringent organization of the denomination, and certain suggestions were "recommended to the several Conventions, Associations, and Societies," which, we confess, seem to us to embrace a system of ecclesiastical order too much resembling the arrangements of the Presbyterian church. At the close of the meeting a Committee was appointed to prepare a Protest against American Slavery, to be presented to every Universalist clergyman for his signature; which has since been published, with over three hundred names affixed to it. Instead of any further remarks of our own, we are glad to avail ourselves of the language of our friend, the editor of the Montreal *Bible Christian.*

"During the last month (September) a General Convention of the Universalists of the United States met in Boston. It was the largest meeting of the kind ever held by them. There were more than two hundred clergymen, besides the lay delegates, present on the occasion. The number of Universalists in Boston during the two days of the Convention proper, is said to have exceeded ten thousand. The nature of the topics discussed was highly interesting and important — calculated to elevate the character and augment the usefulness of the denomination generally. The proceedings of the Convention were marked with earnestness, harmony, and charity. A very eloquent discourse was delivered in the School Street church, by the Rev. E. H. Chapin, and repeated by request in the Warren Street church. In this discourse the preacher urged the necessity of an educated ministry. A considerable share of the discussions of the body was connected with education; and there was

also an acknowledged necessity for a more perfect organization of churches and societies, which received a good deal of attention. So great were the numbers in attendance, that meetings were held in three or four churches at the same time. The occasion was one of great congratulation among the members of the denomination, not only because of the numerous attendance, but also on account of the business transacted and the spirit which prevailed. The official document states 'it was the largest and happiest meeting of their General Convention.'"

Ordinations and Installations. — Rev. DAVID FOSDICK, who recently resigned his ministry at Sterling, was installed as minister of the Hollis Street Society in BOSTON, Mass., March 3, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Putnam of Roxbury, from Isaiah xxi. 11; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Dr. Parkman of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship was given by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Boston; the Charge, by Rev. Dr. Frothingham of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Gannett of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Huntington of Boston, and Lincoln of Fitchburg.

Rev. RUFUS PUTNAM CUTLER, a graduate of Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as Pastor of the Second Unitarian Church and Society in PORTLAND, Me., March 18, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Boston, from Ephesians iv. 3; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Nichols of Portland; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Bartol of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Lynn; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H.; and the other services by Rev. Messrs. Cruft of Boston, Nichols of Saco, Me., and Parkman of Dover, N. H.

Rev. MARK A. H. NILES, formerly a Trinitarian Congregational minister in Marblehead, was installed over the Second Unitarian Society in LOWELL, Mass., April 8, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Peabody of Boston, from John xxii. 20, 21; the Prayer of Installation was offered by Rev. Mr. Bartlett of Marblehead; the Right Hand of Fellowship was given by Rev. Mr. Miles of Lowell; the Address to the Society, by Rev. Mr. Waterston of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Bulfinch of Nashua, N. H., Muzzey of Cambridge, and Whitman of Lexington.

Rev. WILLIAM GUSTAVUS BABCOCK, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School, was ordained as an Evangelist, in PROVIDENCE, R. I., (with reference to his charge of the ministry-at-large, in that place,) April 8, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Hall of Providence, from Revelation xx. 17; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. Frothingham of Boston; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Gray of Boston; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Ware of Fall River; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Osgood of Providence, and Barnard of Boston.

Rev. JOHN NELSON BELLOWS, of Walpole, N. H., was ordained as Minister of the First Parish in FRAMINGHAM, Mass., April 15, 1846. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Mr. Bellows of New York, from 1 John i. 1 and 3; the Ordaining Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Ripley of Lincoln; the Charge was given by Rev. Mr. Muzzey of Cambridge; the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Rev. Mr. Lothrop of Boston; the Address to the People, by Rev. Mr. Robbins of Boston; and the other services, by Rev. Messrs. Brigham of Taunton, Hill of Waltham, and Lippitt of Boston.

INDEX.

A

Abbot, A. W., Lost Wheelbarrow by, 306.
Adshead, J., on Prisons etc., 122.
American Women, Duty of, to their country, 47–55—Miss Beecher's Work on, 47—perils of the country, 49,— want of teachers, 51 — plan for preparing them, 52—objectionable note, 55.
Andrews, Rev. J., biographical notice of, 24—28.
Anti-Slavery Bible-Argument, 470.
Apocalypse. See *Stuart*.
Archives of Criminal Law, 122.
Arnold, T., Lectures on Modern History by, 140.
Augustine, St., and his Times, article on, 1—24—study of antiquity, 1—revival of the Fathers, 3—Taylor's Ancient Christianity, 5—Oxford Library of the Fathers, 6—earlier Fathers, 7—Augustine, 8—early life of, 9—his Manicheism, 11—acquaintance with Ambrose, 13 — conversion, 15 — baptism, 16—works, 17—Poujoulat's History of, 19—changes since his time, 21—Pelagius and Channing, 23—Augustine and his Works, article on, 203—223—Confessions, 203—controversy with Pelagius, 205—not intolerant, 209—tendency of his system, 210—City of God, 212—Sermons, 215—character of his mind, 216—resemblance to Edwards, 217—practical sense, 218—force of will, ib.—personal habits, 219—scholarship, 220—claimed by different parties, ib.—his true place, 223.

B

Baldwin, T., Gazetteer of, 145.
Bartol, C. A., Discourse by, 474.
Beckwith, G. C., Book of Peace by, 146.
Beecher, Miss. See *American*.
Bigelow, H. J., Address by, 309.
Bird, J. & H., Singer's Text Book by, 148.
Boston Association, Letter of to J. Pierpont and Reply, 309.
Boston Churches, Letter to, 309.
Boy of Spirit, 306.
Brazer, Rev. J., biographical notice of, 434—439.
Briggs, G. W., Collection of Hymns by. See *Hymn Books*. Volume of Discourses by, 233—247—title of, 233—sermon writing, 235—importance of the sermon, 237 — character of Briggs's Discourses, 238 — defects, 239 — excellencies, 242 — extracts, 242.
Bunker's Hill, Doubts concerning Battle of, 247—266—human credulity, 247—grounds of belief in Battle, 249—Hume's principle applied, 251—credibility of witnesses, 252—event improbable, 254—conflicting testimony, 255—origin of the story, 257—monument, 258 — means of perpetuating belief, 261—close of the argument, 263—use of Hume's theory, 265.

C

Carlyle. See *Cromwell*.
Cartee, C. S., Questions etc. by, 304.
Cheney, H. V., Early Martyr by, 303.
Cheshire Hymns. See *Hymn Books*.
Christianity without Christ, 77—94—name of Christ set aside, 78—sects and divisions, 79—Athanasian creed, 81 — Swedenborgianism, 82 — natural religion, 83 — philosophical unbelievers, 85 — philanthropy, 87—modern orders, ib. — partial organizations, 89 — sufficiency of Christianity, 93.
Christian Union, 56—69—grounds taken, 57—faith, love, 58—different explanations of Christianity, 59 — inferences, 60 — union amid differences, 61—illustrations, 62—principle of union, 63—relation to controversy, 64 — candor, 65 — truth, 67—consequences, 68.
Clarke, J. F., Sermon by, 474.
Convention, New York, 151—Sunday School, 155.
Coquerel, A., Sermons of, reviewed, 321—332—notice of the author, 321 — character of his Sermons,

323 — French preaching, 325 — mental training, ib.—extracts, 326, 330 — style, 329 — fervency, ib.— study of foreign writings, 332.
Cowles, H. See *Perfectionism*.
Cromwell, and Puritanism, 440—459 —writers on, 440—Guizot, 441 —seventeenth century not comprehended, 442 — prejudices against Cromwell, 443 — charge of hypocrisy, 445—levity, 446—moods of mind, 447—charge of usurpation, 449—murder of the King, 451 — character of, 452—Vindication of Cromwell, ib.—false judgment on 16th and 17th centuries, 453 — English and American prejudice, 454—revolution and conservatism, 455—New England Puritans, 457—influence of Puritanism, 458.
Cushman, R., Sermon by, 475.

D

Dedications, 156, 318.
Dix, D. L. See *Prisons*.

E

Ecclesiastical Record, 151, 310, 477.
Edmond, A. M., Broken Vow, etc. by, 143.
Eliot, J. D., Address by, 150.
Ellis's Hymns. See *Hymn Books*.
England, Religious Life of. See *Retrospect*.
Europe, Remarks on, 476.
Everett, A., Essays of, 144.

F

Faucher, J., on reform of Prisons, 122.
Fathers, Oxford Library of, 6.
Flint, J., Discourses by, 308.
Fraternity of Churches, 478.
Friends, Schism in Society of, 195 —203—J. Wilbur's book, 195—spirit of Quakerism dead, 196—Quaker Discipline, 197—origin of separation, 199 — early Friends, 201—tendency of religious controversies, 202.
Fundamental Laws of Reasoning. See *Mill*.
Furness, W. H., Discourses by, 150, 308, 474.

G

Gannett, E. S., Sermon by, 150.

H

Hacket, H. B. See *Winer*.
Harrington, H. F., Discourse by, 308.
Hall, E. B., Discourse by, 149.
Hall, N., Sermon by, 307.
Harvard College and its Benefactors, 309—intelligence respecting, 318.
Hillard, G. S., Lecture by, 475.
Hollis St. Society, Letter from, 309, —"Remarks" on, 476.
Hood, G., History of Music in New England by, 301.
Housekeeper's Annual, 148.
Hoyt, R., Chaunt of Life by, 143.
Huntington, Sermon by, 308.
Hymn Books, New, 29—47—multiplication of, 29—former collections, 32 — Belknap's, ib. — New York, 33, 40 — Dabney's, ib. — Greenwood's, ib. — Willard's, 34 —Lunt's, ib.—old hymns retained, 35—Warren St. and Pitts St. collections, 36 — Robbins's, ib. — Flint's, 37—Church of the Disciples', ib.—Cheshire, 38—Ellis's, ib. — Briggs's, 41 — Eliot's, 42 — Baptist and other collections, 43—Fox's Hymns and Anthems, 45.

I

Immortality, Arguments for, 349—363—teachings of nature, 349—desire of immortality, 351—conception of death difficult, 353—skepticism unnatural, 355—soul invisible, 357—man's progressive nature, 358—immortality of the affections, 359—redemption from evil, 360—faith of the heart, 362.
Ingersoll, J. G., Sermon by, 150.
Installations. See *Ordinations*.
Intelligence, Religious, 151, 310, 477. Literary, 318.

J

Jarvis, E., Lecture by, 475.
Jenkyn, J. W., Extent of the Atonement by, 298—Holy Spirit and Church by, ib.
Julius, N. S., Moral Condition of N. America by, 122.

L

Leonard, L. W., Discourse by, 473.
Leonardo Da Vinci's Painting of Last Supper, 411—Dick's copy of Morghen's engraving of, 411—influence of such works, 412—notice of Da Vinci, 413—state of art when he appeared, ib.—works, 415 — death, 416 — Goethe's account of picture of the Last Supper, ib.—expression, 418—grouping, 419—method of preparation, 421—copies of the original, 423.
Levee for Meadville School, 478.
Lewis, T. See *Plato*.

Lieber, F., Lecture by, 308.
Lincoln, F. W., Address by, 150.
Lowell, C., Discourse by, 473.

M

Mahan, A. See *Perfectionism.*
Martineau, J., Discourse by, 149.
Martyria, 302.
Memoirs of New England Village Choir, 302.
Messiah, Handel's, reprint of, 302.
Mill, J. S., System of Logic by, reviewed, 363 — 384 — Whately's Logic, 363—Whewell's Philosophy, 364—M. Comte's system, 366—Mill's Work, 368—ground covered by logic, ib.—language, ib.—the syllogism, 369—induction, 370—causation, 371—defective or erroneous statements, 373—logic of the moral sciences, ib.—proof of a God, 375—different kinds of reasoning, 377—divisions, 379—idea of a true system of logic, 380—objection, 381—importance of a just logic, 383.
Ministry at Large, 314.
Missionary Subscription, 312.
Mountford, W. See *Martyria.*

N

Noyes, G. R., New Translation of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles by, 424—434—other translators, 424—Noyes's volume, 425—Proverbs, ib.—Ecclesiastes, 426—character of, 427 — Noyes's version, 428—Canticles, 429—general merit of Noyes's translations, 430—questionable renderings, 431—his series of translations, 433.

O

Ordinations and Installations, 155, 316, 480.

P

Palfrey, J. G., Discourse of, on Dr. Ware, 94.
Panidèa, 470.
Parker, T., Discourse by, 308.
Peabody, O. W. B., Discourse by, 474.
Pentonville Prison, 133.
Perfectionism, 391 — 410 — reaction against speculative theology, 391—Mahan's views of condition of Church, 393—Cowles's statement, 394—perfection in holiness, 395—how understood, 397—Antinomian Perfectionists, 398—Oberlin Evangelist, and Quarterly, 399—Upham on the Interior Life, 400—character of his Life of Faith, 401—Religious experiences, 403—extracts, 404—influence of his views, 406—sanctification, 407—Christ's mission, 409.
Phillips, S. C., Address by, 309.
Pierce, J., Addresses by, 307, 475.
Pilgrims, the, at Leyden, 385—391 — Sumner's Memoirs of, 385 — condition of, ib.—place of worship, 387—Robinson, ib.—grave of, 388—Sumner's arguments, 389.
Plato against the Atheists, 108—122—Lewis's edition, 108—title of work, 109—classes of offenders, 111—nature of Atheism, 112—remedies, 113—soul, a genus, 115—future punishment, 117—worship and sacrifice, 119—editorial remarks, 121.
Poetical Contributions.—The Snow, 266 — Parable, 267 — Invocation, 268—Tree of Life, 269.
Poetry for Home and School, 146.
Poujoulat. See *Augustine.*
Prescott, W. H., Miscellanies of, 144.
Prisons and Prison Discipline, 122—138—Miss Dix, 122—separation of prisoners, 125—solitary confinement, 127—objects of prison discipline, 129—objections to separate system, 131—separate system in Europe, 133 — Prison Discipline Society, 135.
Puritans. See *Cromwell* and *Retrospect.*
Putnam, G., Election Sermon by, 308—Installation Discourse. See *Unitarian Denomination.*

R

Reasoning, Easy Lessons on, 185.
Reed, H. See *Arnold.*
Retribution, 224—233—language of New Testament, 224—retribution in a future state, 227—consequences of excluding it, 229.
Retrospect of Religious Life of England, Tayler's work on, 284—297 — character of the work, 286 — Church of England, 287—state of at close of reign of Henry VIII., 288—progress of reformation, ib.—Puritanism and Independency, 290—Baxter, 292—Owen, 293—influence of Puritanism on literature, 295—free inquiry, 297.
Robbins, C., Sermon by, 474.
Rückert, translations from, 267, 269.

S

Sargent, J. T., Address by, 476.
Sherwin, J., Algebra by, 147.
Slavery, Protest against, 156.
Sparks, J., Library of American Biography by, 147.
Stearns, O., Sermon by, 149.
Stone, E. M., Address by, 150.
Stuart, M., Defence of Old Testament Canon by, 69—its singular character, ib.—nature of its argument, 71—effect on critical inquiries, ib.—not well sustained, 72—erroneous statements, 75.—Commentary on the Apocalypse by, 161—194—position and previous writings of Prof. Stuart, 161—Commentary on the Hebrews, 164—on Romans, 165—character of the Apocalypse, 167—early opinions, ib.—contents and style of Stuart's work, 168—authorship and authority of the Apocalypse, 171—inspiration of, 172—Stuart's exegesis erroneous, 174—Apocalypse not Trinitarian, 175—difficulties attending the Trinitarian exposition, 176 — overthrow of proof texts, 178—texts examined, 180—application of principles, 183—Christ's coming, 185 — forced interpretation, 187—Christ distinguished from God, 189—symbolic numbers, 190—wants of the times, 193.
Studies in Religion, 304.
Sumner, C., Remarks on Oration of, 150.
Sumner, G. See *Pilgrims*.
Suringar, W. H., on Prison Discipline, 122.
Swett, S., Sketches, etc., by, 476.

T

Tayler, J. J. See *Retrospect*.
Taylor, I., Anc. Christianity by, 5.
Teacher's Present, 305.
Testament, Old. See *Stuart*, and *Noyes*.
Tuthill, L. C., Onward, etc., by, 305.

U

Unitarian Annual Register, 148.
Unitarianism, American, condition of, 310—in England, 313.
Unitarian Denomination, The, 459—471 — Dr. Putnam's Discourse, 459 — Denominational existence, 460—ecclesiastical usages, 462—Christian name, 463—fellowship, 466 — individualism, 467—Unitarian principles, 469—importance of association, 470.
Universalist Convention, 479.
Upham, T. C., Life of Faith by. See *Perfectionism*.

V

Vestiges of Creation and Sequel, 333—349—author's position and purpose, 334—theory of the earth, 335—Divine forethought in Creation, 337—difficulty stated, 338—laws of nature, 339—extent of natural law, 340—scientific argument, 342—man's rank in Creation, 343—his moral and spiritual life, 344—dissent from author's theory, 345—fallacy involved, 347—merits of the controversy, 348—American editor, 349.

W

Walt and Vult, 299.
Ware, Rev. H., Life and character of, 94—107—early life, 95—settlement at Hingham, 96—domestic relations, ib. — appointment to Hollis professorship and subsequent controversy, 99—participation in the Unitarian controversy, 102—connexion with the Divinity School, 104—close of his life, 106.
Ware, Rev. H. Jr., Memoir of, 270—284—early life, 271—devotion to the ministry, 272 — domestic afflictions, 274—character, 275—visit to Europe, 277—removal to Cambridge, 278 — influence as Professor in the Theol. school, 279—death, 280—amount of his labors, ib.—personal qualities, 281—Letters, 283.
Ware, J., Memoir of H. Ware Jr. by. See *Ware, Rev. H. Jr.*
Warren, J. C., on physical education, 144.
Waterston, R. C., Poem by, 150—Service Book by, 138.
Whitney, F. A., Address by, 470.
Winer, G. B., Hacket's Chaldee Grammar by, 141.
Wilbur, J., Narrative etc., by. See *Friends*.
Winthrop, R. C., Address by, 150.

JUL 2 - 1946